SHAKTI IN ABHINAVAGUPTA'S
CONCEPT OF MOKSHA.

722.

CEFALU RICHARD FRANCIS
DEGREE DATE: 1973

Published on demand by
University Microfilms International
300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
30/32 MORTIMER ST. LONDON WIN 7RA, ENGLAND

This is an authorized facsimile
printed by microfilm/xerography on acid-free paper
in 1982 by
UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INTERNATIONAL
Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.
London, England

74-2733

CEFALU, Richard Francis, 1944-
SHAKTI IN ABHINAVAGUPTA'S CONCEPT OF MOKSHA.

Fordham University, Ph.D., 1973
Religion

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

SHAKTI IN ABHINAVAGUPTA'S CONCEPT OF MOKSHA

BY

RICHARD F. CEFALU

B.A. St. Francis College, N.Y., '68
M.A. Fordham University, N.Y., '70

DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE
DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY AT FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK
1973

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

May 2, 19 73

This dissertation prepared under my direction by

RICHARD F. CEFALU

entitled SHAKTI IN ABHINAVAGUPTA'S CONCEPT OF MOKSHA

has been accepted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the

Degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY in Theology

José Pereira

(Faculty Adviser)

Jose V. Pereira, Mentor

Preface

I would like to thank my mentor, Professor José Pereira, for his help in guiding the Sanskrit translations which appear in the appendices to this dissertation. I wish to thank also Professor Thomas Berry who gave unstintingly both of his time and books. It was he who first introduced me to Indian studies. Lastly, I wish to thank my wife, Jane, for her patience on many long nights which I spent studying away from home.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

आत्मा प्रकाशवपुरेष शिवः स्वतन्त्रः
स्वातन्त्र्यनर्मरभसेन निजं स्वरूपम् ।
संच्छाद्य यत्पुनरपि प्रथयेत पूर्णं
तच्च क्रमाक्रमवशादथवा त्रिभेदात् ॥

<u>Tantrasāra</u>, Chapter One
terminating verse

The Self whose form is light, Śiva, the Independent,
in the impetuous sport of his liberty first obscures his
essence, and then, its fulness revealed, illumines it again,
in triple phasis -- gradually or of a sudden.

PROLOGUE

Abhinavagupta is one of the great intellectuals of the Hindu religion and the preëminent thinker of Śaivism, one of that religion's two important branches. Indeed, his work is the consummate embodiment of the characteristic modalities that the Śaiva doctrine confers on Hinduism — the Godhead's awesome vitality (conveyed through the imagery of unquenchable libidinousness) and especially its power to destroy (expressed through the symbols of poison, fire and death), which is paradoxically its bestowal of liberating peace. No aspect of Śaivism represents this power of destruction more cogently than that of śakti or Divine Power, which is the main topic of this essay.

Abhinava develops this idea of Divine Power in its two phases. First he elaborates it as the means whereby Śiva veils his majesty as God to experience himself as man and the world; this is his descent from Godhead. Second, he discusses it as the way through which this obscuration is destroyed, returning Śiva to plenary consciousness; this is his repossession of transcendence — liberation — which is attained both contemplatively and aesthetically. Contemplatively, by the mystical appearance of twelve śaktis, concretely and circularly perceived; aesthetically, through the dramatic or poetic experience of the sentiment of tranquility (śāntarasa), the primal ground of man's emotions, which is Śiva himself.

Śakti (Divine Power) thus has two aspects: obscuring (bondage) and revealing (liberation). After investigating the former in the texts of the Trika (Threefold) School, of which Abhinava is the chief exponent, this essay explores the latter, particularly in Abhinava's two works, the Prabodhapañcadaśikā (Enlightenment in Fifteen Verses) and the fourth chapter of his Tantrasāra (The Essence of Tantra), both of which are rendered into English for the first time in this dissertation. These are the major sources for explaining śakti's role in liberation.

We have been helped in this study by two important scholars. First, Raniero Gnoli, whose translation into Italian of the Tantrasāra and whose discussion of Abhinava's theory of the beautiful in his The Aesthetic Experience According to Abhinavagupta have been indispensable aids. Professor Gnoli has also written several articles on Kashmir Śaivism, some of which have been published in certain numbers of East and West, and two in particular, which appeared in Revista di Studi Orientale, Roma,1959: "Il secondo Capitulo della Śivadṛṣṭi di Somānanda", and "Passi selti ae tradotti del Parātriṁśika Vivaraṇa", pp. 55-79 and 163-182 respectively. He has also translated into Italian the complete twelve volumes of Abhinava's Tantrāloka which have yet to be published. Second, K. C. Pandey, whose books, Abhinavagupta and Indian Aesthetics, and whose translation of Abhinava's Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vimarśinī called Bhāskarī, III (Lucknow, 1954), are other important works which have been consulted.

A third scholar, Lilian Silburn, whose writings I have not been able to study (having only very recently learned of them) has translated into French Abhinava's Paramārthasāra, Vijnana Bhairava (Paris, 1961) and the Mahārtha Mañjarī (to be published). Miss Silburn has also published two articles on the Trika School: "Le Vide, le Rien et l'abîme" and "Les sept Vacuitiés d'après le Çivaisme du Cachemire"(Hermes, Volume VI, Le Vide: Experience spirituelle en Occidente et en Orient, pp. 15-62 and 213-221 respectively). In addition, L. D. Barnett's exposition of Abhinava's Paramārthasāra and J. L. Masson's translation of the Abhinava Bhāratī, which is Abhinava's commentary on Bharata's Treatise on Drama, have also been helpful. Hence we see that the Trika School of Kashmir is relatively unexplored, which may well be due to the difficulty of the texts.

The originality of this dissertation lies in its treatment of the specifically mystical aspects of Abhinava's thought. Our task is to demonstrate that, for Abhinava, both the mystical experience and the aesthetic perception of tranquility occasion liberation. In so doing, the precise relation of the aesthetic experience to the mystical will become clear: the aesthetic experience of tranquility equates with the mystical experience of identity with Śiva. Abhinava's formulations of these two experiences as two aspects of Divine Power is original. This uniqueness is crystallized through a contrast with the concept of śakti in Tamil Siddhānta, the other major Śaiva tradition, in which Divine Power -- the way to liberation -- is achieved by meditation alone.

Therefore, this essay is primarily concerned with liberation through Divine Power which is itself permeated by one of the essential characteristics of divinity -- peace.

CHAPTER I

ŚAIVISM, KASHMIRI ŚAIVISM AND ABHINAVAGUPTA

In order to evaluate the concept of śakti, we shall need to examine Śaivism and its beliefs in general, its main theological traditions -- principally those of the Tamil country and of Kashmir -- and of Abhinavagupta's own place in Kashmiri Śaivism.

(1) ANTIQUITY AND EARLY SECTS OF SAIVISM

Śaivism or a faith very like it existed in the first known civilization of the Indian subcontinent, that of the Indus Valley, whose probable date is from 3250 to 2750 B.C.[1] Important among its centers were Harappa and Mohenjodaro, remarkable for their town planning and for their seals -- three of which bear the image of a two-horned and three-faced naked god seated in yogic position on a stool with his heels pressed closely together.[2] For most scholars "no uncertainty . . . attaches to the divinity of the seated Śiva of the seals, a

---

[1]John Marshall, Mohenjodaro and the Indus Civilization. London: Probsthain, 1931, p. 106.

[2]E. Mackay, Early Indus Civilization. London: Luzac, 1948, p. 75.

figure which . . . is replete with the brooding minatory power of the great god of historic India."[3] Noteworthy among his physical characteristics are his forehead protrusion, his two horns, three faces and erect penis. The horns fan out from the right and the left of the head, and, together with the protrusion, form a shape like a trident (triśūla), the god's characteristic weapon, so prominent in later iconography.[4] The three faces, visible in the great Maheśamūrti panel at Elephanta, were later to become part of Śiva's pentad of faces, represented especially in the five-faced priapic cult images (the pañcamukhaliṅgas) of which the Elephanta sculpture is a bas-relief version. As for the god's erect penis, the linga, it is the sole object of the Śaiva cult, with a place of honor in the sanctums of Śaivism's temples. The Indus Valley seals show this god surrounded by figures of virile and powerful animals -- like tigers, elephants, rhinoceroses and bulls -- thus reflecting Śaivism's obsession with the theophanies of passion and destruction, and evoking also Siva's epithet of "lord of beasts" (paśupati). It is thus certain that this religion, so distinctively Śaiva in character, was in existence towards the end of the fourth millenium B. C.

Archaeology is not the only evidence of the religion's antiquity. The Ṛg Veda recounts that Rudra (traditionally

---

[3] M. Wheeler, The Indus Civilization. Cambridge at the University Press, 1968, p. 109.

[4] G. M. Moraes, "A Mohenjodaro Figure", New Review (Calcutta) 10 (July-December, 1939), p. 446.

identified with Śiva) discharges brilliant shafts across heaven and over the earth.[5] He possesses weapons which slay cows and men, and when cattle fare unharmed, due either to supplications or chance, Rudra is styled "protector of the cattle" (paśupa).[6] In addition, the identification of Rudra with the "lord of beasts" is uncontested, and Pasupati, as we saw, is Śiva. In the Vedas also Śiva becomes increasingly important. From the period of the later Yajurveda he is the great god (Maheśvara).[7] Consequently there is no doubt that Rudra and Śiva are identical.

But the key texts for understanding both the overt and covert apotheosis of Śiva as Supreme Lord are the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad III, 8, III, 11 and I, 10. These are direct assertions attributing to Śiva personality and Godhead:

> I know this mighty Person (Puruṣa) of the color of the sun beyond darkness. Only by knowing Him does one pass over death. There is no other path for going there.
>
> Who is the face, the head, the neck of all, who dwells in the heart of all things. All pervading is he and bountiful. Therefore omnipresent and kindly.
>
> What is perishable is primary matter (pradhāna). What is immortal and imperishable is Hara (the Bearer, the soul). Over both the perishable and

---

[5] Rg Veda VII, 46, 3 and I, 114, 10 in Ralph T. H. Griffiths' Hymns of the Rg Veda. 4 volumes. Benares: E. J. Lazarus and Company, 1889-1892, III, 63 and I, 199.

[6] Ibid., I, 114, 9 in I, 198.

[7] K. M. Pannikar, A Survey of Indian History. Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1957, p. 5.

> the soul the one God (deva) rules. By meditation on Him, by union with Him, by entering into His being more and more, there is finally cessation from every illusion.[8]

The personal god Śiva supplants the impersonal Absolute of traditional Brahmanism. Later the Upaniṣad (IV, 21 is one instance) evinces a devotional attitude towards the god. Moreover, in I, 5 and I, 8 are the first indications of concepts later common in Śaivism, such as that of the recurring number "five" (which is associated with Śiva's five manifestations in Purāṇic Śaivism) and of the triad Lord-creature-bond (pati-paśu-pāśa) which is prominent in the schools both of the North and the South.

Further, in IV, 2 there is the equation of Śiva with the Lord of creation or Prajāpati. Jan Gonda advances that a careful reading of the Upaniṣads shows the continual reiteration of the number "five."[9] For instance, both in Maitri Upaniṣad II, 6, 6 and in Praśna Upaniṣad II, 3 Prajāpati enters into the creatures which he had produced as the five vital breaths. Again, in the Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad II, 3, which describes the rites for the attainment of the highest treasure, a fivefold method and a fivefold oral acclamation is prescribed. Moreover, in

---

[8]Robert E. Hume, The Thirteen Principal Upanisads. London: Oxford University Press, 1931, 400, 401, and 396. Text: Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, with the commentary of Sankarācārya, a Dipika of Sankarananda, a Dipika of Narayana, and a Vivarana of Vijñāna Bhagavat. Poona: Anandasrama Press, 1890. 210 pp. cited in Hume, p. 492.

[9]J. Gonda, Vishnuism and Snaivism: A Comparison. University of London: Athlone Press, 1970, p. 46.

Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad I, 4, 17 man's completeness is assessed as the five aspects of mind, speech, breath, eye and ear. This verse also remarks that the sacrifice, the animal, the person and the world are each fivefold. Since fullness is implicit in three of these instances -- man's completeness, the attainment of the highest treasure and the sacrifice, Gonda suggests that the number "five" in the Upaniṣads has a nuance of consummation.[10]

Śiva shares the concept of perfection which "five" connotes on two counts: he is equated with Prajāpati, who produces man's five vital breaths and in later mythology he has five faces. Also, since Śiva is identified with the Lord of creation who dwells in man, Śiva himself is connected with man's perfection.

Śiva assumes the characteristics of the older god, Viśvakarman, the creator of the universe. Ṛg Veda X, 81, 3 describes Viśvakarman as having eyes, and faces, arms and feet everywhere,[11] the very words the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad III, 3 uses to describe Rudra. In reproducing the words the Śvetāśvatara author also wished to reproduce the idea, except, of course, for him the creator of the universe is Śiva.

In the Mahābhārata also there are three important stories attesting to the worship of Śiva as the Supreme God. The first is that of Śiva's destruction of the triple castle

---

[10]Ibid.

[11]R. T. H. Griffiths, op. cit., IV, 260.

of the asuras (demons). The sons of the asura Tāraka, seeking revenge for a previous loss to the gods, were now harassing them. They had, through austerities, secured a boon from Brahmā that they were not to be overcome except by one who with a single arrow could destroy their three cities or castles (tripura). The harried gods complained to Brahmā who advised them that only Śiva, or Mahādeva, could subdue the demons. They approached Śiva, presented him with a chariot, conducted by Brahmā and constituted of all the forms of the universe, and provided him with a bow and arrow composed of Viṣṇu, Soma and Agni. Discharging the arrow, Śiva destroyed the triple castle, thus earning the loud praises of the gods.[12]

The second story is that of Dakṣa's sacrifice. Dakṣa is beginning a sacrifice at Gaṅgādvara in the Himalayas, to which all the gods, except Rudra, are invited. A devotee of Rudra, Dadhici, incensed by the insult, tells Dakṣa that due to this omission his sacrifice will result only in calamity. Dakṣa, unperturbed, continues not to acknowledge Rudra. Dadhici repeats his ominous prophecy which Dakṣa ignores by offering the sacrifice to Viṣṇu, whereupon Śiva manifests his power by creating a demon who annihilates Dakṣa's sacrifice. Dakṣa, "converted", sings Siva's praises.[13]

---

[12] Karna Parvan, vv. 1391-1572 in John Muir, Original Sanskrit Texts in the Origin and History of the People of India, Their Religion and Institutions. London: Trubner and Company, 1872, IV, pp. 223-226.

[13] Śanti Parvan, vv. 10272-10332, ibid., pp. 374-377.

The third story is that of the visit of Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa to the Himalayas, where in a vision they see Śiva in his dwelling. They bow their heads and sing a hymn in his praise, invoking him as the unborn and the creator of the universe.[14]

Complex in its beliefs and hoary with antiquity, a religion like Śaivism could not avoid proliferating into sects. Of its early ones known to us, three are most important, the Paśupatas, the Lākulīśa Paśupatas and the Kāpālikas. The doctrine of the Paśupatas, the most important of these sects, is fivefold. The efficient cause of the world is the Lord (pati) and the rope (pāśam); the effect is man who is "the beast" (paśu) fettered by the rope. The means to liberation are meditation on the symbol om (ॐ) and the ritual action of bathing in ashes (which represent Śiva the destroyer). Liberation itself is the cessation of misery or release from saṁsāra. Moreover, the Lord (who is only the efficient cause), the material cause (pradhāna) and souls are eternal and distinct. Also the Lord is influenced by karma in creation.[15] The dualism and three categories of the Paśupatas (the pati-paśu-pāśam) were to become the bases of the Śaiva Siddhānta school.

---

[14] Droṇa Parvan, vv. 2838-2906, ibid., pp. 184-186.

[15] Bhāmatī 2: 2; 37, a commentary on Śaṅkara's Brahmasūtrabhāṣyam. Ed. A. S. Sastri and V. L. Pansikar. Bombay: 1917.

The Lākulīśa (Lord of the Club) Paśupatas differed from the Paśupatas only in their concepts of the means of liberation and liberation itself. They held that one should meditate for at least six months -- during which the devotee was to become detached from objects and attached to Śiva. Not only did they bathe in ashes, but they also grew long nails and matted their long hair. They feigned madness and indulged in loud singing. For them liberation was constant and unbroken contact with the Lord, with his powers being communicated, not manifested. In this liberation one attained Śiva's powers of knowledge and action. Mādhava, the historian of the darśanas, remarks that their concept of liberation included two levels: the lower characterized by action and the higher by cessation of action. The former consists of pious prayers and meditation whereas the latter is unitive consciousness.[16]

The Kāpālikas (Skull-bearers), macabre and hedonistic, were a sort of Cārvāka school with a Śaiva coloring. They differed from the Paśupatas only in their concepts of the means of liberation and of liberation itself. They meditated on the soul seated on the vagina. Ritually, they indulged in strong drink, sexual intercourse and meat-eating. They conducted human sacrifices to obtain magic powers and drank liquor from skulls, particularly Brahmin skulls. Cemeteries were their

---

[16] Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha, Trs. E. B. Cowell and A. E. Gough. London: Kegan Paul, 1961, p. 107.

favoured abode, and for them liberation was to become Śiva so that they might sexually enjoy Pārvatī.[17]

From the Paśupatas arose the Śaiva Siddhānta school which includes both Sanskrit and Tamil sources, the latter of which are celebrated for their devotional motifs. The former works, comprising at least those of Sadyojyoti (IX century A.D.), Nārāyana Kantha (XI century A.D.) and Aghoraśivācārya (XII century A.D.), culminate in King Bhoja of Dhāra's Tattva Prakāśa (c. A.D. 1050). Both Sanskrit and Tamil works of this system, besides their usually dualistic proclivity, maintain three categories: the Lord, the bond and soul. These persist even when there is universal annihilation; they are the conditions of all experiences, empirical and transcendental.[18]

The Śaiva religion had a remarkable diffusion and vitality. Its hold, as a Śaiva scholar tells us, extended not only over the whole of India from the Indus Valley to Bengal, but stretched out across the sea to Greater India and the Archipelago and beyond the northern mountains to central Asia.[19] To its

---

[17] Bhāmatī 2; 2:37. Some of the clearest descriptions of the Kāpālikas are found in Ramanuja's commentary on the Brahmasūtra 2; 2:35.

[18] Śrikumāra's commentary on Bhoja's Tattva Prakāśa 2:5, p. 74. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, as cited by J. V. Pereira in his unpublished dissertation, "The Influence of Śaivism on the Rock Temples of the Deccan and the Konkan." Bombay: St. Xavier's College, 1958.

[19] K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, "A Historical Sketch of Śaivism." The Cultural Heritage of India. IV, Adapted. The Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture. Calcutta, 1956, 63.

vitality the great numbers of extant Śaiva temples of immense prestige and sanctity, situated in India's holiest places, bear witness. "We have the most sacred temples of Siva," observes the historian Dasgupta, "in the north in Badrikāśrama, in Nepal (Paśupati-nātha), in Kāśmīr, in Prabhāsa, in Kathiavar (the temple of Somanātha), in Benares (the temple of Viśvanātha), the Nakulīśvara temple in Calcutta, and the temple of Rāmeśvaram in extreme South India."[20] A doctrine of such prestige and antiquity can be expected to have a theology equally ancient and illustrious, and to this I now turn.

(2) GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SOURCES

The later theological reflection of Śaivism is embodied in the Tantras, Āgamas and Purāṇas, and is reported by the commentators on the *Brahmasūtras* and by the historians of the *darśanas*. Abhinava's thought professes mainly to be an exposition of the Tantras, especially of those of the Trika, none of which I have been able to consult -- like the *Nandiśikha*, the *Raurava*, the *Svacchanda*, the *Triśirobhairava*, the *Mataṅga*, the *Rudrayāmala* and the *Mālinīvijaya*, which for Abhinava is the quintessence of the scriptures. Of the other sources, I have chosen five as a basis for analyzing Śaiva thought before its systematization by the theologians of the Tamil and Kashmiri schools: the *Vayāvīyasaṁhitā* of the

---

[20]Surendranath Dasgupta, *A History of Indian Philosophy V*. Cambridge at the University Press, 1955, p. 8.

Śivamahā-purāṇa of unknown date, but probably within the first eight centuries A. D.; the Pauṣkara Āgama and the Mṛgendra Āgama dating from about the third century A. D.; Śaṅkara's eighth century reference in the Brahma Sūtra Commentary II, 2, 37; Śrīkaṇtha's Brahma Sūtra Commentary of about the eleventh (?) century A. D.; and Mādhava's fourteenth century Sarva-Darśana-Saṁgraha. As we shall see, these texts are almost entirely monist.

The author of the Vayāvīya-saṁhitā elaborates on the three categories of the Paśupatas. He first treats the relation between God and the world. Śiva is pure consciousness,[21] Lord (pati) and Spirit (puruṣa). The world is Nature (prakṛti), illusion (māyā) and the soul (paśu). Implicit in the soul is the fetter (pāśa), which is an original state of ignorance (mala). Śiva is both the instrumental and material cause of the world. Creation itself entails the soul's link to the illusion of the world -- a distortion of the soul's original reality. For in the second section of the same saṁhitā it is recounted that Śiva himself binds all beings through impurities (malas) and illusion (māyā) and that only he can liberate them at his pleasure which is commensurate with the devotion of the individual soul.[22]

The soul's original fetters are three (and this is standard doctrine in the Śaiva Siddhānta School): egoism

---

[21] Vayāvīya-Saṁhitā, VII, 2, 12 in ibid., 111.

[22] Vayāvīya-saṁhitā, VII, 2, 12 in ibid., 118-119.

(*āṇavamala*), through which the all-pervasive soul understands itself as limited; action (*karmamala*), resulting from the experience of good and evil deeds; and the body (*māyīyamala*), formed through illusion. The means used in creating this fettered soul is divine power (*śakti*). From this power arises the whole world through the illusory process.

While the soul is in fact Śiva in an empirically distorted state, it does not understand this. Since pure consciousness (Śiva) is entirely other than the original ignorance (*mala*) how can this ignorance impugn the purity of consciousness, resulting in distortion? The Śaiva's reply is that

> as pure gold may be associated with dross without affecting its nature, so the pure consciousness that constitutes the Siva within us may remain pure, even though it may be covered with *mala* from beginningless time. The *mala* does not affect the nature of the self as Siva.[23]

Moreover, the means to liberation (*mokṣa*) in this *saṁhitā* are purification in accordance with the preceptor's instruction, the proper worship of Śiva and the yogic meditational exercise which should develop the idea that Śiva is all-pervasive.

Our second source, the *Pauṣkara* and *Mṛgendra Āgamas*, belong to a body of literature whose date and origins are obscure. The word *Āgama* means "a work inculcating the

---

[23]Unknown author of *Paśupati-pāśa-vicāra-prakaraṇa*. Adyar Library MS in *ibid.*, 27.

mystical worship of Śiva and Śakti."[24] In addition to this definition and to the fact that medieval Śaiva works generally refer to the Āgamas, only C. V. N. Ayyar gives an explanation of their origins.[25] He suggests that from about 400 B. C. the practice began of enabling anyone to begin worship of Śiva through initiation. The aspirants would be instructed in meditation by a guru. As their number grew, rules were framed for initiation. Handed down as they were from one generation to the next, these rules came to be equally esteemed as the Vedas which also followed the same tradition of descent. A belief arose that they were revealed by Śiva himself. Further, because the Śaiva devotees thought that the rules of the Āgama were not for all, they were carefully concealed.

Similarly, much of the theology of the Āgamas is unknown except for three new ideas proffered in the Pauṣkara Āgama. First, the idea that when Śiva is reflected in his own will, the condition called sadāśiva emerges. This was later to be defined as the initial experience of empirical being. Second, that divine power is immediate intuition and action. Third, that the eternity of knowledge is veiled in time by the soul's impurity.[26]

---

[24] M. Monier-Williams, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, p. 129, column three. Oxford at the University Press, 1899.

[25] C. V. N. Ayyar, The Origin and Early History of Śaivism in South India. Madras University, 1936, p. 46.

[26] S. Das Gupta, op. cit., citing chapter four of the Pauṣkara Agama, 33 and 31.

The third of our five sources — a reference in Śaṅkara's commentary on the Brahma Sūtra together with a brief description in Mādhava's Sarva-Darśana-Saṃgrahā — informs us of the existence of a dualist Śaivism, the school of the Paśupatas, whose thought trend differs from that of the Vāyavīya-saṃhitā, and of other monistically oriented Śaiva schools. The Paśupatas (as we saw) do not acknowledge Śiva as the material cause of the world.

Śrīkaṇṭha, our fourth source, wrote a Śaiva commentary on the Brahma Sūtra. He has three outstanding points: the inference of Śiva's existence from the second sutra of the Brahma Sūtra; the co-existence of Śiva's transcendence and immanence; the evolution of graded categories of existence in descent from Śiva's Godhead. The second sutra of Bādarāyana's Brahma Sūtra describes Brahman as that from which all things have come into being, in which they are maintained and into which they will ultimately return. Śaṅkara and the subsequent Vedānta commentators do not accept this sutra as advancing an argument for Brahman's existence. They regard it rather as a mere summation of the general intention of the Upaniṣads. Moreover, they hold that it is only a statement harmoniously reconciled with the statements of other Upaniṣadic texts. Śrīkaṇṭha, however, considers this sutra as the basis from which the existence of the supreme Lord Śiva may be inferred.

Continuing this exegesis, Śrīkaṇṭha (propounding a theology of bhedābheda, or identity-in-difference) maintains

that Śiva remains transcendent while his power (śakti) becomes the material universe. He further asserts that this power comprises both consciousness and matter. Although there is separation of function, there is unity of essence. Thus Śiva in himself is transcendent whereas Śiva as power is immanent:

> Brahman (Śiva) exists in quite a transcendent manner, apart from the individual souls and the inanimate world. But yet, since the individual souls and the material universe are emanations from his energy (śakti), the world of souls and matter may be regarded as parts of him, although they are completely transcended by him.[27]

This is substantially the doctrine propounded by the Vaiṣṇava Vedantins like Bhāskara, Nimbarka, Ramanuja, Vallabha, and Caitanya.

Lastly, Śrīkaṇṭha maintains that there is a gradual emanation from the transcendent Śiva when he is associated with the energy of consciousness into the categories of the divine power (śakti), the initial experience of empirical being (sadāśiva), the crystallized experience of the empirical within Siva (maheśvara) and the balance of the empirical and the transcendental within Śiva (śuddhavidyā).[28] This is a sequence of categories which accords with those accepted, as we shall see, by the Trika School of Kashmir.

Mādhava's presentation of Śaiva theology -- our fifth source -- is generally based on the Āgamas, with particular

---

[27] Ibid., 85, citing Śrīkaṇṭha's commentary on Brahma Sūtra II, 1, 2. Volume II, 31, second parenthesis added.

[28] Ibid., 90, citing Śrīkaṇṭha's commentary on Brahma Sūtra II, 38. Volume II, 109.

citations from Mrgendra, Pauskara, Kirana and Karana Āgamas. He cites the triad lord-soul-bond and the four stages of spiritual life: practical duty, ceremonial action, meditation and realization. He also asserts that, "the Supreme Being is a cause in dependence on our actions. . . ."[29] Hence Śiva is the universal agent, but not without regard to the actions of men; primary causality takes cognizance of secondary causality. Precluding any objection, the Āgama author posits that it does not violate an agent's independence to assert his acting conjointly with the means. He gives the analogy that Śiva's independence is like a king's bounty showing itself in gifts which, however, "are not irrespective of his treasurer."[30] Consequently Śiva's independence is not flawed because he allows man the free will to cooperate or not with him. Śiva also has the five functions of creation, preservation, destruction, obscuration and grace, and his body consists of pure power.

Regarding the nature of the soul, the Śaiva rejects the Sānkhya position that the soul is devoid of action. When all the impurities of egoism, action and its fruits, and materiality are removed a state of identity with Śiva obtains — union in intelligence in the form of an infinite vision.[31] The soul, then, can hardly be called inactive since it is

---

[29]Mādhava's Sarvadarśansaṁgrapha. Trs. E. B. Cowell and A. E. Gough. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1961, p. 113.

[30]Ibid., p. 116.

[31]Ibid., p. 120.

actively involved in the vision of Śiva who is other than the soul while remaining one with it. This state of identity is attested in śruti, which in this case is the Mṛgendrāgama. For Śaivism holds that the Āgamas also are revelation, and not just the Vedas, as Hindu tradition generally believes.

A threefold classification of souls is also proposed in accordance with the Śaiva Siddhānta doctrine of the three fetters or impurities. The first are those who are only under the influence of the inherent impurity of egoism which causes the soul to understand itself as limited (āṇavamala). Their actions are cancelled either by commensurate experience of the fruits of these actions or by contemplation. The second are those who are under both āṇava and karma malas: their fetters are destroyed only in the reabsorption of the universe (pralaya). The third are those who are bound by āṇava, karma and mayīya malas. All three classes, whose impurities have matured, are subject to liberation by the grace of Śiva -- who becomes a guru to grant it. Mādhava gives an anonymous quotation which I have identified as being from King Bhoja:

> Those creatures whose mala (impurity) is matured, by putting forth a healing power, He, assuming the form of a teacher, unites by initiation to the highest principle.[32]

This remark emphasizes that the degrees of impurity may be expunged by Śiva's grace.

---

[32] Ibid., p. 124. Identified in Bhoja. Tattva Prakāśa. E. P. Janvier, Tr. Indian Antiquary. Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1925, p. 153, parenthesis added.

Finally, since the nature of the fetter is implicit in that of the soul, Mādhava reiterates that the soul's impurities constitute the fetter. In addition, he cites the Mṛgendra Āgama which lists a fourth component of the fetter as the overpowering energy of Śiva which obscures the soul (tirodhana śakti).[33] How this differs from āṇavamala, whose function seems identical, is not explained.

These general Śaiva sources do not offer the sophisticated speculation of a Śaṅkara; nor do they have seminal texts as profound as the Upaniṣads to comment on. For the Āgamas are not equal in breadth of thought to the Upaniṣads nor are they as profusely cited in the Śaiva commentaries as are the Upaniṣads in the Brahma Sūtra interpretations. They are also generally unavailable.[34] However, these theological sources do present a general consensus. They definitely agree on the lord-soul-bond triad (pati-paśu-pāśa), on Siva as being at least the instrumental cause of the world, that the relation of the soul and the world to Śiva is mediated by his divine power, and that for liberation certain religious exercises are enjoined -- though dependent on Śiva for their efficacy. Also

---

[33] Ibid., p. 125.

[34] Mariasusai Dhavamony is the only one who informs us where some of the Āgamas may be consulted. The four Agamas: Kamikan, Karanam, Suprapetam and Vatulam and the two Upagamas, Mirukantram and Paus̱karam were published in Madras (before 1925); excepting the Karanam, all are available in the British Museum Library. Love of God According to Shaiva Siddhanta. Oxford, 1971, p. 117, note 3.

the Sāṅkhya categories are compounded with the five transcendental ones offered by Śrīkaṇṭha. Finally there is accord on the impurities of āṇava, karma and mayīya. Therefore these five general sources of Śaiva deliberation tender some basic ideas but no elaboration. This the two schools of the Tamil country and of Kashmir were to provide.

(3) THE TAMIL PHASE OF ŚAIVA SIDDHĀNTA

But the first school, Tamil Śaivism, did not do so until the thirteenth century. Its earlier phase, however, contributed powerfully to that later development. From the seventh to the ninth centuries the Tamil country of South India witnessed a great upsurge of pupular religious devotion (bhakti) towards Viṣṇu and Śiva. Its numerous Śaiva hymns, fraught with the sentiments of the sinner's unworthiness and the greatness of Śiva's love, strongly influenced the theological statement of the Śaiva Siddhānta which was made four centuries later. Tamil Śaivism is the devotional high point of the worship of Śiva and its conceptual strength is also compelling. Since I will focus on that strength through this school's discussion of Divine Power in the fifth chapter of this study, I shall limit myself here to a brief indication of its devotional orientation.

Tiruvaḷḷuvar's Tirukkuṟal is one of the earliest Dravidian works of the Tamil country, probably dating from before the seventh century A. D. In the first chapter

Tiruvalluvar calls Śiva "the gracious One who is the ocean of goodness."[35] This appraisal of Śiva might also be rendered "God is love", for surely the ideas are extremely similar, if not identical. Since it is only natural for religious man to respond to the Good, this early estimation gave an impetus to the continually developed devotion of the Tamil Śaivas. At the same time that this piety to Śiva became prominent, the devotee's self-deprecation reached a similar level. This self-abasement was grounded in the teaching of the three impurities found in the five general theological sources I alluded to. Hence the ardent follower of Śiva chastises himself and bewails his corruption. He is enslaved to āṇava, the egoism sundering him from Śiva. Karma and māyīya malas involve him in the evil of existence divorced from the Good -- Śiva. He feels a deep sense of personal guilt in the condition of his separation and he longs for Śiva's uniting grace.

The soul's unworthiness and the largesse of Śiva's love are the major components of Tamil bhakti. These feelings of self-abasement and longing for Śiva's grace arise from the faith of the early Śaiva saints who sang of Śiva's self-revelation to them through his grace. The most remarkable aspects of Tamil Śaivism are its intense love of God, its belief that no spiritual progress is attainable without this love, and its preoccupation with praising God.

---

[35] (aṟav āḻiy antaṇan) l. 8. in M. Dhavamony, op. cit., p. 115.

These themes are amply documented in the Tamil works. However, Appar and Māṇikkavācakar soar highest in their sentiments. Appar laments:

> Evil, all evil, my race, evil my qualities all.
> Great am I only in sin, evil is even my good.
> Evil my innermost self, foolish, avoiding the pure.
> Beast am I not, yet the ways of the beast I can never forsake.
> . . . Ah! wretched man that I am, whereunto came I to birth?[36]

and Māṇikkavācakar rejoices:

> Fool's friend was I, none such may know
> The way of freedom; yet to me
> He shew'd the path of love, that so
> Fruit of past deeds might ended be.
> Cleansing my mind so foul, He made me like a god.
> Ah! who could win that which the Father hath bestowed?[37]

These two men, who date in the seventh and ninth centuries respectively, illustrate Śaivism's devotional orientation. Conscious as we are of this direction, it is now necessary for us to be aware of the major contemplative dimension of Śaivism. That school, which developed in the North of India, is the second school to elaborate the general theological sources. While Śaiva devotion began and flourished in the Tamil country, Śaiva contemplation was emerging in Kashmir. The theologies of these two schools were to be fused in the Vīraśaivism of the Kanarese country in the thirteenth century, whose theology combines the Siddhānta's devotional fervor with the Kashmiri School's intellectual complexity.

---

[36] F. Kingsbury and G. E. Phillips, Hymns of the Tamil Śaivite Saints. London: Oxford University Press, 1921, p. 47.

[37] Ibid., 127 citing Tiruvācakam, p. 37.

(4) KASHMIRI ŚAIVISM

Śaivism's Kashmiri phase is theologically the richest in the Hindu tradition. Most of its major texts remain untranslated, but one can still reconstruct its history from secondary sources (some of which abound in translations of selected texts). We gather that the Trika School was founded in the ninth century by Vasugupta (c. 825-850), who was followed by an illustrious line of theologians like Somānanda (mid ninth century), founder of the Recognition School, Vasugupta's pupil Kallata (early tenth century), and Utpala (also early tenth century), disciple of Somānanda and teacher of Abhinava, and Ramakaṇṭha I (second and third quarters of the tenth century). The school culminated in Abhinavagupta (A. D. 953-1015). Among the great ācārya's disciples was the poet Kṣemendra (born after A. D. 990 and died after 1065), one of Sanskrit literature's important figures and one of its few satirists. Kṣemendra, however, was first attracted to Buddhism, and later in life veered toward the devotional Vaiṣṇavism of his other teacher, Soma Bhagavata. Abhinava was followed by Bhattavamadeva (early eleventh century), Kṣemarāja (second quarter of the eleventh century), Yogaraja (mid eleventh century) and Jayaratha (twelfth-thirteenth centuries).[38] The tide of Islam, which had begun to overwhelm India already in Abhinava's time, but which had been held back from Kashmir by its still powerful kings,

---

[38] K. C. Pandey, Abhinavagupta: An Historical and Philosophical Study. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1963, p. 9.

finally burst into that province in the thirteenth century, inundating it in the fourteenth. With Islam's triumph, the great Trika school came to an end.

Why did the Trika System emerge? According to Abhinava to remind men of a previous revelation of Śiva. There had been sixty-four scriptures revealed by Śiva, which, due to the evil influence of the Kali age and the gradual disappearance of the seers who knew them, came to be lost. Śiva, viewing the resultant spiritual darkness, felt compassion for men. He therefore:

> . . . appeared on the Kailāsa mountain in the form of Śrīkaṇṭha and commanded the sage Durvāsas to spread in the world the knowledge of the śāstras again . . . . It is this Advaya (non-dual) Śaiva teaching . . . which is spoken of as the Trika.[39]

This passage is important for two reasons: many Śaivas believe that Abhinava is an incarnation of Śrīkaṇṭha (Śiva himself); and Somānanda, the author of the Pratyabhijñā Śāstra, claimed descent from this same sage Durvāsas. Similarly many believed that Vasugupta, who wrote the Śiva Sūtras and Spanda Kārikās, received them from Śiva himself, an idea which accords with the cited passage. In addition to these three men — who, numerous Śaivas assume, enjoyed a special intimacy with Siva — Utpala, the author of the Īśvara Pratybhijñā Sūtras, Lakṣmanagupta and Kṣemarāja were also prominent exponents of this system.

Their teachings may first be approached through

---

[39] Tantrāloka (no page given) as translated by J. C. Chatterji in Kashmir Śaivism, Government of Jammu and Kashmir, 1962, p. 6, parenthesis added.

Mādhava's assessment, formulated in five important points. First, Śiva is simultaneously other than and the same with the various acts of knowing and the various objects of knowledge. Second, he is the transcendent Self posited by one's own consciousness and he possesses independence, the power of witnessing all things in himself. Third, one can recognize oneself, through certain exercises, as identical with him[40]-- hence the name pratyabhijñā, "recognition." A scheme of transcendence-immanence and of divine union is advanced here. Fourth, the soul, subject to a cosmic illusion, has only partial consciousness of himself. The fullness of consciousness -- recognition -- is dependent on the expansion of the cognitive powers. Fifth, devotion to Śiva allows one to receive that independence (svatāntrya) which is the essence of the divine nature.[41] Independence is identical with Divine Power (śakti) thereby indicating a mediating function for it.

According to Mādhava therefore the Recognition or Trika School -- which treats of God, Divine Power, and the soul -- is similar to the general theological sources of Śaivism in its two teachings -- the three fetters binding one to a cosmic illusion, and the transcendence-immanence schema. It is disimilar in its two teachings of Recognition, which is a monistic identity of the soul with Śiva and of Divine Power, which is

---

[40]Gurunātha Parāmarsha of Madhurāja Yogin, MS, Śloka 23 as translated by Pandey, op. cit., p. 20 and Chatterji, op. cit., p. 24.

[41]Sarvadarśanasamgraha. Trs. Cowell and Gough, op. cit., p. 128.

a reception of grace. Further, these two dissimilarities are related to each other, since Divine Power is necessary for the Recognition.

In explaining both Recognition and Divine Power it is necessary to explore the metaphysical framework of the Trika or Threefold System. K. C. Pandey is the most prolific translator of the Trika texts. He relates, first of all, that the Threefold (Trika), the Recognition (Pratyabhijñā), and the Appearance (Ābhāsavāda) Systems are essentially identical. Hence a citation from one is equally representative of the other two. The Appearance School contends that this world is a real manifestation of Śiva. It is not an illusion. Abhinavagupta's Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vimarśinī reads:

> All that appears; all that forms the object of perception; all that is within the reach of the external senses or the internal mind . . . is Ābhāsa (appearance).[42]

But this appearance has as its substratum an All-Inclusive Universal Consciousness, called Complete Consciousness (pūrṇa saṁvid).[43] What appears is real because it is a manifestation of the Complete Consciousness, Śiva. Since Siva is real, his manifestation, this world, must be real. However, this world is also ideal:

> . . . because it is nothing but an experience of the Self (Śiva) and has its being in the Self exactly as

---

[42] Ibid., p. 132.

[43] Abhinavagupta, Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vimarśinī I. 35-36 as translated by Pandey, ibid., p. 321.

our own ideas have theirs within us.[44]

Abhinava understands that the world's existence is God's experience since it is within the divine fullness. At the same time, he submits, the world is real since it does enjoy a conditionally separate reality of its own. Hence both the world and the individual are real manifestations of Śiva which are inextricably united with him. They are not, as the Advaita Vedānta holds, mere appearance (vivarta) which upon intuition (anubhava) is sublated , leaving only the Brahman.

Furthermore, the Appearance System maintains that the Universal Self (Supreme Śiva) comprises the shining light of consciousness and the power of will (prakāśavimarśamaya). The prakāśa aspect is self-luminosity, the substratum of anything which can be manifested; the vimarśa aspect is the will power which gives rise to self-consciousness, selecting from within the self-luminosity what is to be manifested as apparently separate from it.[45] Thus the will power is that energy of Supreme Śiva which directs itself to the static self-luminosity so that the latter may be expressed in the separate appearances of itself which is the empirically apprehensible world. The Recognition School is fond of the simile of the dreaming self and the objects of a dream.[46] Just as the individual pictures

---

[44]Abhinavagupta, Parātriṃśika Vivaraṇa, 21, as translated by Pandey, ibid., p. 321.

[45]Pandey, ibid., p. 320.

[46]Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vimarśinī I. 108. (Pandey, p. 338). emphasis added.

to himself objects in a dream, so also Śiva occasions this world in himself. Therefore, the empirical world is truly an exterior manifestation of the interior reality, Śiva. It is Śiva's partial expression of his entire self-luminosity. The world is really one with Śiva just as a word is one with its speaker.

There are two other important similes. The waves exist in the ocean before and after they arise, as appearances exist in Śiva before and after they arise.[47] The reflection of an elephant is apparently separate from the mirror, although it is in fact one with the mirror, as the world is apparently separate from Śiva although in fact one with him.

Moreover, Śiva manifests himself as apparently separate because it is his nature to do so. Man, the object of Śiva's manifestation, is himself Śiva. Hence the empirical appearances constitute Śiva's freely accepted behavior towards himself. He forgets his majesty, as subject, to experience himself as object. We may ask, how does this objective manifestation arise? The answer is through the thirty six categories which is our next subject of investigation.

---

[47] Ibid., p. 330.

(5) THE THIRTY-SIX TRIKA CATEGORIES

All of Abhinava's theology revolves around the Trika categories -- a miscellaneous and complex mass of concepts of Tantric, Āgamic, Purāṇic and Sāṅkhya origin, which can be ordered or concatenated only with difficulty. I shall therefore first enumerate them in an inventorial fashion, and then endeavor to deduce them in an a priori manner from the Trika's fundamental postulates. Only the first eleven categories are peculiar to Śaivism; the remaining twenty-five are those of the Sāṅkhya School, taken over without modification.

Śiva

1. Śiva-tattva - Pure Luminosity
2. Śakti-tattva - Pure Consciousness
3. Sadāśiva or sadākhya-tattva - the first experience of empirical being with emphasis on the "I."
4. Īśvara-tattva - Continued experience of empirical being with emphasis on the "This."
5. Sadvidyā or śuddhavidyā-tattva - balance of the "I" and the "This"; understanding that the manifested world is identical with Śiva; Pure Wisdom

Man and the world

6. Māyā - illusion; the self-veiling of divinity
7. kalā - Limited Action
8. vidyā - Limited Knowledge
9. rāga - Limited Interest
10. kāla - Time
11. niyati - Space

Man and the world (continued)

12. purusa - Man

13. prakrti - The World, objectivity

14. buddhi - Impersonal Judgement recalling "All-This" of sadvidyā-tattva

15. ahamkāra - Personal Sense destructive of "All-This" of sadvidyā-tattva

16. manas - Desire illustrated in perception and action

17-21. Five Perceptual Capacities (jñānendriyas) smelling, tasting, seeing, touching, hearing

22-26. Five Active Capacities (karmendriyas) resting, excreting, locomotion, handling, speaking

27-31. Five Subtle Elements (tānmātras) smell, taste, color, touch and sound

32-36. Five Gross Elements (mahābhūtas) water, light, air, sky and earth

This categorical multiplicity stems from five notions. The first is the basic postulate of the Trika School, that there is only one Reality, which is Intelligence or Consciousness. This Reality

> . . . is indeed the light that constitutes all things, since non-light can never become the essence of anything. It is also not more than one, for it is inconceivable that light (which is one with its own essence) should also identify itself with an essence not its own, for this would lead to a contradiction, and no essence can contradict itself. Neither can space and time break up its unity, since the very same light is their essence too. There is therefore but one light, which is consciousness; and that consciousness essentially constitutes the light of all things is a point

that all concede without controversy.[48]

Second, this Consciousness is both ineffable and conceptualizable. In Abhinava's words:

> This light is not dependent, for dependence is illuminability, and the illuminable cannot be lit up unless there exists a light other than itself. But no other light exists. So there is but one light, and it is an independent one -- a light which, precisely because of its independence and freedom from the limitations of space, time and form, is all pervading and eternal, omniformed and formless.[49]

and

> The universe is in essence consciousness, and is the place where the Intelligence manifests itself. And since the universe is what is reflected, it is the Lord who is the supporter of the reflection. And the fact of being the essence of all things is the nature of that Supreme Lord, an essence that is not unconceptualized, it being impossible for anything that has Intelligence as its nature to be without reflection on its own reality. For if such a reflection were to be lacking, all that exists would be nothing but insensibility.[50]

This multiform conceptualization produces the world of things:

> All that constitutes existence is nothing but reflection on the sky of intelligence.[51]

Hence the supreme attribute of the sole Reality -- Consciousness -- is liberty, which permits the Reality to constrict or to expand; to constrict itself in limitations or to free itself from them. As ineffable and unrestricted it is transcendent, undifferentiable and beyond manifestations, and is known as the

---

[48] Tantrasāra, first Āhnika, pp. 5-6.

[49] Ibid., p. 6.

[50] Ibid., third Āhnika, pp. 11-12.

[51] Ibid., p. 10.

Supreme Śiva (paramaśiva). As self-conceptualizing and self-restricting it is immanent, differentiated, and comprises all manifestations or categories (tattvas), from Śiva down to the earth.

Consciousness conceptualizes in order to understand itself, and this brings us to the third of Abhinava's postulates, that of the range of this self-understanding, which can be either macrocosmic or microcosmic. The macrocosmic self-understanding is integral and undistorted; it represents Siva's inner life and his fecundity ad intra, and it must be remembered that in an idealistic system like the Trika, fecundity can be expressed only through ideas. This macrocosmic understanding is also called the Pure Way, constituted of Siva's wakeful aspect, whereby that deity knows himself as unitively God and the world, and expresses his knowledge in a sentence like, "I am this unmanifested Universe." On the other hand, microcosmic self-understanding is a distorted one, and represents Siva's life and fecundity ad extra. It constitutes the Impure Way, and is Śiva's sleeping aspect,[52] in which he imagines himself as disjunctively man and the world. This knowledge is the result of self-obscuration (māyā), the clouding of Śiva's glory and the emptying of his plenitude.

Fourth, the polarity of subject and object that is the basis of all conceptualized knowledge. Subject and object are found conjunctively or unitively in the macrocosmic self-

---

[52] Chatterji, op. cit., p. 88.

cognition and disjunctively in the microcosmic. This knowledge, however limited in one aspect, is essentially perfect and hence is expressible in terms of the number five. This is Abhinava's fifth postulate, and in accordance with it, most of the categories (thirty, to be precise), are assembled in groups of five. As I remarked above, "five" represents perfection for the Upaniṣads. It is also the number of the syllables of Śaivism's basic mantra "Adoration to Siva " (namah śivāya).

The thirty-six categories (tattvas) comprising the manifestations of Consciousness from Śiva down to the earth, illustrate and amplify the above five principles. Of the sentence, "I am this unmanifested universe", Siva's macrocosmic self-understanding makes explicit "I am this", and his microcosmic self-understanding, "(the hitherto) unmanifested universe." The self-understanding that is macrocosmic can be understood under three aspects -- of subject, object, and of both together. As subject, it comprises Categories 1 to 3, Śiva, Śakti (Divine Power) and Sadāśiva (Incipient Empirical Being). As object, it is Īśvara (Crystallized Empirical Being), and as subject and object, Sadvidyā (Pure Wisdom). Of these, the first two are the most prominent, and Śiva is related to Śakti as a flame to its light. In Śiva just the "I" of "I am this" becomes explicit and in Śakti, the "I am."[53] Sadāśiva, Īśvara and Sadvidyā explicitate the "I am

---

[53]Pandey, op. cit., p. 363.

this" -- but Sadāśiva with the stress on the "I", Īśvara on the "this" and Sadvidyā with an equal emphasis on both the "I" and the "this."

These five categories together constitute the five modes of macrocosmic self-cognition, by which also the world is made visible and the relation between macrocosm and microcosm established. They are together given the name *śakti* -- with the word used in a trans-categorical sense, unlike *śaktitattva* (Category 2), where the meaning of *śakti* is strictly categorical. These modes are (1) *cit* *śakti*, the power of intelligence or Śiva, the first Category -- which is self-revelation or self-luminosity, the pure light of intelligence. (2) *ānanda* *śakti*, the power of bliss -- or Śakti -- the second Category, the power of realizing absolute joy, independence and rest. (3) *icchā* *śakti*, the power of will or Sadāśiva, the third Category, the power both of supreme ability and of wonder at that ability. (4) *jñāna* *śakti*, the power of knowledge or Īśvara, the fourth Category, the power of bringing all objects in conscious relation with oneself. (5) *kriyā* *śakti* or Sadvidyā, the fifth Category, the power of creating.[54]

Self-understanding is a process that paradoxically leads to self-obscuration, and the process starts with the very first Category, Śiva. As plenary consciousness, he is blessed in himself, and needs to know nothing to continue in that beatitude, not even the world, which is then in a state

---

[54]Chatterji, *op. cit.*, p. 47, citing *Tantrasāra*, chapters One and Two.

of latency. However, he lets himself feel the need to manifest the world, to actualize its latent multiplicity, and to share his bliss with a multitude of self-experiencers.[55] This can only become possible through an act of self-negation or self-emptying, and the latter can itself be accentuated by being contrasted with the bliss that is Śiva's own self.

This contrast is actualized in the second Category, Śakti, which at the same time embodies Śiva's blissful self-reflection as well as the principle of negation that causes the unmanifested world to disappear and thus to be experienced as lacking.

Category 3, Sadāśiva, begins to supply this lack, for it is the Category of Incipient Empirical Being, and in it Śiva feels that he is one with the emerging world as expressed in the phrase "I am this"; however, the emphasis, as I said, is on the "I", not on "this" (the world). What this category makes explicit is Śiva's will to the world manifestation, and Abhinava compares the deity to a painter at the moment when he decides to paint a picture.[56]

---

[55]Compare Vatican I on God the creator and the motives of creation: Hic solus verus deus bonitate sua et "omnipotenti virtute" non ad augendam suam beatitudinem nec ad acquirendeam, sed ad manifestandam perfectionem suam per bona, quae creaturis impertitur, liberrimo consilio ("simul ab initio temporis utramque de nihilo condidit creaturam, spiritualem et corporalem, angelicam videlicet et mundanam, ac deinde humanam quasi communem ex spiritu et corpore constitutam"). Henricus Denzinger. Enchiridion Symbolorum. Friburgi Brisgoviae MCMXLVII, Herder and Company, p. 491, N. 1783.

[56]Pandey, op. cit., p. 366.

However, it is in the object and not in the subject that multiplicity is rooted, and unless attention is turned to the latter, multiplicity will never arise. This exigency is met in Category 4, Īśvara, the Category of Crystallized Empirical Being, where "I am this" is better expressed as "This am I." In the previous Category, Self was realized as self; in this one it is realized as being. In the previous Category, things existed very much like a sketch on a canvas; now they exist like the completed painting.[57]

Knowledge of multiplicity needs both subject and object, hence a right amount of emphasis, an equal correlation between both. They must be both united and separated, and unity must be felt to exist in diversity. This balance is achieved in Category 5, Sadvidyā or Pure Wisdom, where the subject is the pole of unity, and the object, that of diversity. The latter is best expressed in the dichotomy "All-This", or, better still in the sentence, "All-This proceeds from me and is created by me — I am the author of all this."[58]

Here, however, it begins to appear that the further the object is from the subject, the more tenuous the object's connections with it, the more multiplicity will the object be able to generate. It appears, in other words, that the more complete the disjunction between subject and object, the more uninhibited multiplicity will be — and what disjunction can

---

[57] Ibid., p. 365.

[58] Chatterji, op. cit., p. 76.

be more effective than the blotting out of the subject itself? All this is thought to be achieved by Category 6, Māyā, Illusion or Self-Obscuration, the power that Śiva has of forgetting himself. By it the subject is reduced to being an unconscious thing. But, of course, multiplicity can never exist without witness (the subject blotted out by Māyā) who must be reinstated, although limitedly. This partial restoration is effected by the Five Sheaths (kañcukas) which comprise Categories 7 to 11 -- Limited Action (kalā), Limited Knowledge (vidyā), Limited Interest (rāga), Time (kāla) and Space (niyati). The subject thus reconstituted is Category 12, Man (puruṣa), who however appears not as one self but as many. The distinguishing characteristic of man is ignorance of his real nature; his "I" is but the "I" of the Pure Wisdom Category clouded and dimmed.

Similarly the "this" of the Pure Wisdom Category is clouded into the "this" of the object (Categories 13 to 36), constituted of the vaguely perceived world. From the object stage, first arrived at in prakṛti, arises judgement (buddhi, Category 14), which is the memory of the universal "All-This" of the Pure Wisdom Category. In addition, the three qualities (guṇas) exist in the subject. Judgement reflects the quality of goodness (sattva guṇa). It is an experience of calm joy, an impersonal conscious state in the limited experiencer, man. From judgement arises the "I" sense (ahaṃkāra, Category 15), the realization of a personal self of a limited particular "this" in contradistinction to the unlimited "All-This" of the Pure Wisdom Category. In it the quality of passion (ragas guṇa)

predominates. The capacity of focusing attention (manas, Category 16) primarily mediates between the "I" sense and the other senses. It is the instrument of the "I" sense and it also needs judgement to illumine what it perceives. Since it attends both upon the "I" sense and upon judgement for elucidation, it embodies the quality of darkness (tamas guna).[59] From māyā (Category 6) through manas (Category 16) Śiva understands distortedly that he is separate from the world, retaining this understanding in the five perceptual and five active capacities (Categories 17-26).

How do the perceptual capacities (jñānendriyas, Categories 17-21), the active capacities (karmendriyas, Categories 22-26), the subtle elements (tānmātras, Categories 27-31), and the gross elements (mahābhūtas, Categories 32-36), originate? The attentive capacity as the instrument of the "I" sense is desire.[60] This means the wish to perceive or to act. It follows that the attentive capacity evolves along with the means of perception and of action. For without these means, the end of desire is not attainable. Further, in the emergence of a desire -- for instance, the inclination to see -- there is necessarily implied an object of that inclination -- for instance, a tree. But since the "I" sense and the attentive capacity are both within the subjective experience of man, it follows that the

---

[59] Ibid., pp. 108-119, passim.

[60] Ibid., p. 119. It should be remembered that ahaṁkāra traces itself back to buddhi, and the latter to puruṣa, thus attributing the efficacy to puruṣa.

object inplicit in these subjective categories must also abide within man. For, if an object is implied within man's subjective categories -- in his capacities of having a personal self and of focusing attention and desiring -- how can it be searched for outside of these capacities? Thus a tree is only an exterior projection of the interior "I" sense:

> . . . if, in order satisfactorily to account for the phenomena of knowledge the objects are to be admitted to exist, as they must be, if the facts of experience have not altogether to be ignored, they have necessarily to be admitted to be the creation of the Universal Subject.[61]

Since the "I" sense is only one aspect of man, who is himself a distortion of the Universal Subject (the Śiva-Category), it is ultimately the Universal Subject that creates the object.

Therefore the Threefold System concludes that with the evolution of the five perceptual capacities the objects of perception, the subtle elements (tānmatras) also evolve. These subtle elements in turn are the causes of the gross elements (mahābhūtas). The Threefold School suggests, in an attempted example, that if one asks what might accompany or follow the perception of a variety of sounds in man, one might advance an entity which goes in all directions, the sky (ākaśa). Similarly, what follows the perception of a variety of colors may be designated the form-building and form-destroying principle, which is light. Thus sound causes sky; color causes light.[62] Although the point is obscure, the theme of subsuming

---

[61] K. C. Pandey, op. cit., p. 400.

[62] Chatterji, op. cit., pp. 133-139.

all empirical objectivity within the Universal Self is sustained. In this instance the attempt is to subsume the physical elements. On the other hand, if one argues from the empirical perspective, then throughout the subtle and gross elements (Categories 27-36) Śiva understands that he is separate from man. Therefore, the Categories from māyā to the earth constitute Siva's microcosmic self-cognition.

In order to repossess his macrocosmic self-understanding, Siva must obscure his microcosmic one:

> . . . when the pure consciousness limits itself, then it manifests itself in two ways; firstly, when its limiting function is in ascendancy, it appears as the mind, and, secondly, when its limiting function is subordinated to its manifesting side, it appears as the revealing consciousness.[63]

Apparently, revealing consciousness is liberation. I shall now discuss Abhinava's life and his position in the Trika school.

(6) ABHINAVAGUPTA'S PLACE IN THE TRIKA SCHOOL

Atrigupta, Abhinava's earliest known forebear, lived in the Antar-Vedi, the land between the Ganges and the Jumna. Like so many other scholars, he was invited to Kashmir by King Lalitāditya Muktāpiḍa (A. D. c. 724-760), who helped him to settle at Srinagar on the bank of the Vitastā in front of the temple of Siva under the name of Śitāṁśumauli.[64] From

[63] Surendranath Das Gupta, Indian Idealism. Cambridge at the University Press, 1933, p. 194.

[64] B. N. Pandit, "A Comparative Study of Kashmir Śaivism", unpublished dissertation, Panjab University, Chandigarh, 1969, 79, citing Parātriṁśika Vivaraṇa, 280, and Tantrāloka, 37; 39 and 52. Śitāṁśumauli means "one who has the moon on his head."

A. D. 740 when Atrigupta flourished, to Cukhula (or Narasimha-gupta), Abhinava's father, about two hundred and ten years intervened.[65] This family, rich, learned and intensely devoted to Śiva, provided a conducive ambiance for Abhinava's scholarly and devotional proclivity. The boy's mother, Vimalā, died when Abhinava was very young. Not long after, the instruction of her brilliant son was undertaken, and he was to study under no less than twenty teachers, chief among whom were the following five: Lakṣmanagupta, heir and disciple to Utpala, Abhinava's teacher of the doctrines of the Recognition School; Sambhunatha, a follower of the Suddenness School, under whom the boy learnt the secrets of Tantric ritual and various means of practical realization; Bhūtirāja, apparently a teacher of the Gradualness School; Bhaskara, of the Vibration School -- which originated with Vasugupta and Kallata -- and to whom Abhinava dedicated one of his books; and Bhaṭṭa Tauta, who taught Abhinava poetics and aesthetics.

His mother's early death and his father's consequent adoption of asceticism were important factors in Abhinava's resolution to lead a celibate life. Moreover, his achievement as an exponent of the Śaiva Āgamas gained him recognition as the spiritual leader of the Threefold System's devotees.

His works are voluminous. Pandey lists forty-four of them, of which twenty-three are known, fourteen being published

---

[65]Pandey, op. cit., p. 6.

and nine unpublished manuscripts. The remaining twenty-one are only found referred to in the extant combined works. Abhinava's fourteen published texts comprise one compendium of the ideas in the Bhagavadgītā, three aesthetic works and ten Śaiva theological treatises. The latter works are:

1. Prabodhapañcadaśikā: a summary of basic ideas.
2. Paramārthacarcā: a booklet treating of fundamental Trika principles.
3. Mālinī Vijaya Vārtika: an exposition of the more difficult verses of the Mālinī Vijaya Tantra, which is not extant.
4. Parātrimśika Vivṛti: a commentary on the Rudra Yamala Tantra.
5. Tantrāloka: an encyclopedic twelve-volume work discussing the major themes of the Threefold School.
6. Tantrasāra: a condensation of the Tantrāloka.
7. Tantravāṭadhanika: a briefer condensation of the Tantrāloka.
8. Paramārthasāra: a statement of the essential principles of the Threefold School.
9. Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vivṛti Vimarśinī: a long commentary on Utpala's commentary on his own Pratyabhijñā Sūtras.
10. Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vimarśinī: a shorter commentary on the same.[66]

If we recall that the seminal texts of this school are Vasugupta's Śiva Sūtras and Spanda Kārikās, Utpala's Pratyabhijñā

---

[66]Much of the preceding elaboration of the Threefold System's teaching in section five is buttressed by citations from the Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vimarśinī, thus indicating its significance for the system.

Sūtras and Somānanda's Pratyabhijñā Śāstra, it is plain that Abhinava's works surpass those of his predecessors in volume. The profundity of his thought is unparallelled in Śaiva theology as we shall have occasion to see when we come to assess his Paramārthasāra, and to examine the translations of his Prabodhapañcadaśikā and that of the fourth chapter of the Tantrasāra, and also the commentaries on his works. And if we compare the depth of his reflection and the architectonics of his systematization with the representative work of the other great Śaiva theological school, Meykaṇṭa Tēvar's Śivañānapōtam (Realization of Śiva-knowledge) of c. A. D. 1221, the preëminent Tamil Śaiva treatise, we shall be able to appreciate the fact that Abhinava's works antedate Tēvar's book roughly by two centuries. He is therefore the first great systematic theologian of Śaivism, and remains, as I said, its greatest.

CHAPTER II

THE RELATION OF DIVINE POWER (ŚAKTI) TO LIBERATION (MOKṢA)

Having established Abhinavagupta's position in the history of Śaivism, let us examine his concept of liberation and the part that Divine Power plays in it.

Liberation is the experience of divine union. The oldest traces of this concept are in the Kaṭha, Chāndogya and Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣads. It is also found in the Śvetāśvatara. These works state that man is really one with the timeless reality behind the phenomenal universe, a truth he does not realize due to a beginningless spiritual blindness or darkness. With the destruction of the latter, he experiences the realization of his essential timelessness.

The belief in the perfection of man's true self presupposes that its connection with mundane elements in a subject-object dichotomy is artificial or illusory, and that constitutes its bondage. Abhinava's concept of bondage can best be understood in relation to the five theological systems of Kashmir Śaivism I alluded to in chapter I.

Despite differing names, these systems are essentially the same. (1) The Threefold or Trika System refers to the triad God-Divine power-Soul; (2) the Appearance or Ābhāsa

System treats of Śiva's semblances; (3) the Recognition (Pratyabhijñā) System discusses the unexpected comprehension of the appearances as identical with Śiva; (4) the teaching of Suddenness or Kulavāda concerns God, the Divine Power and their union; (5) the teaching of Gradualness or Kramavāda concerns the same topics but under different aspects. The former system recognizes the Śiva-Means (śambhavopāya), the contemplation on "I" (ahaṁ) as the only direct way to union with Siva.[1] The latter acknowledges the Divine Power Means (śāktopāya) as an equally effective way of uniting with God. This Divine Power Means is the purification of discursive knowledge (vikalpa) through successive stages so that it becomes pure indeterminate knowledge, which is Śiva-consciousness.

These five teachings, although essentially identical, are best understood as two: (a) The Threefold Teaching which subsumes the Appearance and Recognition systems and (b) the doctrine of Suddenness which includes the exposition of Gradualness. These two instructions differ in historical origins and teachers and agree in their espousal of the common Śaiva belief in the three impurities of egoism, action and its fruits, and materiality and also in their central focusing on Divine Power as instrumental in attaining liberation. Therefore, when Abhinava writes in either the Threefold or Suddenness context, these remarks may be appropriated,

---

[1]K. C. Pandey, Abhinavagupta, 461. , In the same place it also treats six other major aspects of Śiva's divinity.

mutatis mutandis, to his general concept of Divine Power and liberation. Notwithstanding minor contextual nuances in each system's comprehension of the latter concepts, their underlying bases are strong enough to warrant their interchangeable use. With these ideas in mind let us now examine Abhinava's concept of bondage, without an understanding of which we shall not be able to comprehend his doctrine of liberation.

(1) BONDAGE

Bondage is duality. As we saw in the last chapter, the impurity of the "I" sense (ahaṁkāra) arrogates to itself inordinate meaning and reality, leads man to conceive the world and Śiva as being distinct from himself, and to view as object what is truly subject. The beliefs that there is really no duality and that a dualistic view originates from the nonrecognition of Śiva are stated clearly in Abhinavagupta's Prabodhapañcadaśikā:

> These two -- bondage and liberation -- arise from the essence of the Supreme Lord. In truth nothing is divided and there is no division in the Supreme Lord (verse 14).
>
> Of that (being) there is non-recognition and of that one dndependence has been affirmed. That (non-recognition) is indeed the saṁsāra which strikes terror into fools (verse 11).[2]

The saṁsāra referred to in verse 11 is that distorted understanding of duality which allows the transmigration of the

---

2. Prabodhapañcadaśikā, vv. 14 and 11, emphases added. See appendix.

self to continue;[3] and the phrase, ". . . of that one independence has been affirmed", refers to the opposite of bondage, liberation, and to their inextricable intertwining. Śiva, through the assumed non-recognition, illumines only the limited reality, man. Abhinava explains this assumed non-recognition in the Tantrasāra:

> The impression of duality is not any autonomously existent thing, but only the ignorance of one's own essence.[4]

Somānanda, in his Śiva Drṣṭi (Considerations on Śiva), also evidences this true perfection of man:

> Liberation . . . is one's basic nature, and therefore does not require any means for its achievement, but its (delights) can not be tasted by a person so long as he appears to be a limited soul in bondage.[5]

The male aspect of Śiva (or the Śiva Category) is quiescent prior to the creation of the world as well as following upon its destruction whereas the female aspect (the Divine Power or Śakti Category) is the active principle of the creation and maintenance of the world. It is in the latter that non-recognition dwells; but, it will be seen, it is also in the latter that full intuition (right reasoning) can be realized.

---

[3]Transmigration of the self is basic to this teaching as to all Indian philosophical systems.

[4]See appendix, 14.

[5]Cited in B. N. Pandit. The Śaivism of Kashmir: A Comparative Study, unpublished dissertation, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India, 1969, p. 255, parenthesis added. Somānanda's Śiva Drsti along with Utpala's Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Śāstra and Abhinava's Tantrāloka are the three most important Threefold works.

(2) ŚIVA AND ŚAKTI

Divine Power (Śakti) from one perspective is the limitation of Śiva as man and the world, while from another point of view it is the return of Śiva to himself. The Prabodhapañcadaśikā reads:

> This frightful resplendent god has the very characteristic of supporting the world, for the world is completely reflected through his energy (Śakti) which is mirrored in his own self.[6]

Divine Power exercises a reflecting function, for like a mirror it reflects the world with which it is united. From a different angle, if one recalls the Appearance System's designation of Śiva -- "consisting of pure luminosity and pure consciousness" -- one sees, as I said before, that Divine Power is Śiva's consciousness of his pure luminosity. Śiva reflects his own pure light in his consciousness which is the Divine Power. This is the original reflection whereby Śiva becomes aware of his own illumination. Then Śiva reflects in his power a secondary reflection of his own radiance which is the world. Hence through his reflection in the Divine Power, Śiva discerns first his own splendor and second the brightness of the world which is but a part of his splendor. This is called the teaching of reflection-secondary reflection (bimbapratibimbavāda). Therefore the world is Śiva's experience appearing to him through his power. Similarly, Abhinavagupta writes:

---

[6] Prabodhapañcadaśikā, v. 4, see appendix.

> Like images in the mirror, the universe is in essence void of distinction and is not distinct from the light in which it is revealed.[7]

It is manifested in the light of Divine Power. In another place a differentiation is made between the analogy of an ordinary mirror and of the divine existence metaphorically conceived as a mirror:

> While in the case of an ordinary mirror, reflections are cast by an external object, in that of the mirror of the Universal Self they are caused by its own śaktis which constitute different aspects of its perfect will power (_śakti_).[8]

Later it will be shown that there are various aspects of this Divine Power. Here the point is that the reflection of the world is effected by its constituent parts.

It should also be indicated that not only is the divine power not the appearance (_vivarta_) of the Advaita Vedānta school as the notion of reflection might suggest, but also that it is not the development (_pariṇāma_) of the Sāṅkhya. While asserting that appearance is conceivable through the notion of reality, the Advaita does not consider it fully real. But the Appearance System deems that the world phenomenon is real, since it is the projection of Śiva's interiority. Divine Power as phenomenal fact is an externalization of Śiva, the noumenal reality. The Sāṅkhya holds that development is a real expansion from one state to another resulting from the

---

[7]Abhinavagupta. _Paramārthasāra_, v. 12. Tr. L. D. Barnett. _Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society_, 1910, p. 712.

[8]Pandey, _op. cit._, p. 439, citing Abhinava. _Tantrāloka_ II, 72, parenthesis added.

former state's destruction or total transformation. For instance, a seed attains the form of a sprout and ceases to be a seed. But such a transformation would destroy Śiva, which is absurd. As one scholar asserts:

> He (Śiva) simply wills to appear in diverse forms and does so without undergoing any change in his basic nature of absolute unity.[9]

In this notion of Divine Power as that energy in which the world is reflected, there are two aspects, transcendent and empirical. The Divine Power as vimarśa, the original vibration whereby Śiva becomes conscious of himself as pure consciousness ("I"), includes the world ("this") within it. Because this idea describes the interior divine life, it is asserted that at the original coming-to-consciousness of Śiva as "I", the world exists as the innermost vision of his fullness.[10] Thus Śiva's self-consciousness as "I" brings with it the vision of the world as completely contained within him. When, however, Śiva spontaneously accepts non-recognition, denying his self-nature and becoming man, this interior vision is obfuscated. Somānanda has also explained this self-veiling:

> The Supreme Śiva forgets, as it were, his nature of being unlimited power in the process of evolution, because it becomes more and more obscured at every step . . . .[11]

Hence from the category of Limited Action (Category 7) to that

---

[9]B. N. Pandit, op. cit., emphasis added.

[10]Arabinda Basu, op. cit., p. 88.

[11]Śiva Dṛṣṭi, 1, in B. N. Pandit, op. cit., p. 238, emphases added.

of the earth (Category 36) man and the world are still reflected in the Divine Power, although, of course, this is not realized. The concept that the world is reflected in Śiva's power primarily denotes the interior vision of the world as a constituent part of Śiva. This is, as I said above, the Pure Way of the first five Categories before the unfolding of the subsequent thirty-one (the Impure Way). The world's reflection in Śiva's power secondarily signifies man and the empirical world. But it designates these in their aspect of aspiring to realize the interior vision which is Śiva's and so unite with him.

This description of the world as reflected in the Divine Power indicates its predominant transcendental dimension. It brings into focus the striving of the empirical for the transcendental. Abhinava corroborates this in Prabodhapañcadaśikā:

> Indeed this highest goddess (śakti) of his yearns for his essence . . .[12]

Therefore, in one sense, the Divine Power is distinct from Śiva since one can only long for what is not one's own. Śiva is more than his power; he is pure luminosity. In another sense, however, Divine Power is one with him since it is only his hypostasis:

---

[12] Prabodhapañcadaśikā, v. 5, see appendix. This may also be read as the reason for the divine fecundity both in creation which is his limitation and in destruction which is his expansion. See also on the unity of Siva and Sakti, Śiva Dṛṣṭi 3, 2-3, in B. N. Pandit, op. cit., p. 177.

> And his *śakti* does not desire separation from the nature of Śiva; there is always identity between these two just as between fire and flames.[13]

Similarly, the empirical world -- reflected in Divine Power -- shares this dialectic of separation from and union with Śiva, although the latter prevails.

(3) LIBERATION

This transcendental-empirical dialectic is concretely demonstrated in man's cognitive structure. Here the notion of discursive knowledge (*vikalpa*) first appears. In the *Tantrasāra* Abhinava explains that it is twofold, empirical and transcendental, the first causing *saṁsāra* and the second enlightenment:

> Now it is by means of this discursive knowledge alone that people presume that their selves are bound, and it is this very presumption that is the cause of transmigration's uninterruptedness. Hence the rise of an adversative discursive knowledge destroys the discursive knowledge from which transmigration originates -- and thus brings about the dawn of enlightenment.[14]

The second type of discursive knowledge that Abhinava refers to is right reasoning (true intuition), which is illimitable and its nature

> is as follows: it is free from all the limited principles -- beginning with the earth and stopping before Śiva -- and is constituted of pure unlimited consciousness.[15]

---

[13]Verse 3 of *Prabodhapañcadaśikā*, see appendix.

[14]*Tantrasāra*, see appendix.

[15]Abhinavagupta, *ibid*.

If one recalls that the Threefold System posits five transcendental categories, in ascending order Pure Wisdom, Crystallized Empirical Being, Incipient Empirical Being, Divine Power and Śiva, then the important transitional point for the attainment of transcendental knowledge is the Pure Wisdom Category. Here man is elevated to the divine dimension of Śiva's interiority; he experiences the destruction of limiting knowledge and the inception of infinite knowledge through Śiva's revealing consciousness.

This is liberation, a realization of Śiva which is duality's destruction and unlimited enlightenment. The means to this realization in the Threefold, Gradual and Suddenness teachings are fourfold, following one upon another: Ceremonial Means (āṇavopāya), Divine Power Means (śāktopāya), Śiva Means (śāmbhavopāya) and Means Without Means (anupāya).[16]

Ceremonial-Means includes various rituals as propaedeutic to establishing concentration on an external object and to experiencing its unity with one's self by means of imagination.[17] Divine Power-Means consist of contemplating pure discursive knowledge which nullifies impure knowledge and its deep impressions of diversity. One impresses upon one's mind the real truth of the absolute unity of the self:

> This is the Supreme Reality, the stability of all things and the vital principle of the universe.

---

[16] Tantrāloka as cited in Pandey, op. cit., p. 312, vv. 1, 7, 8, and Tantrāloka I, 258.

[17] Pandit, op. cit., p. 275.

> By it everything breathes, and it is what I myself really am. So I am truly the very self of the universe, but in essence transcending it.[18]

One must repeatedly sensitize one's understanding to the fact that all phenomena are mere reflections of one's own self.

Śiva-Means is the direct experience of Complete Consciousness, the viewing of pure Luminosity, in which no idea appears and in which the understanding is also inoperative. It is a practice of keeping one's mind absolutely still and yet alert, through strong will power. In it a person feels a sudden thrust of Śiva's energy. After continual performance of this mind-control, Śiva's power becomes increasingly stabilized in the devotee.[19] However, the emphasis on will (<u>icchā</u>) in a sense brings this Means under <u>Śakti</u> (<u>śāktopāya</u>), for Abhinava has interpreted will as independence.

Means-Without-Means (<u>anupāya</u>) is the preceptor's teaching of the Threefold System's basic truth to a disciple who thereby gains immediate liberation. The preceptor counsels:

> You are in fact the Highest Śiva, the absolute Illumination, which is ever surging with the waves of Consciousness. You are ever shining through your own (light) and never need any means for your shining which is your own nature. So wake up from ignorance and experience your natural Godhead.[20]

This experience is attained without Means inasmuch as there is

---

[18] <u>Tantrasāra</u>, 21, see appendix.

[19] Pandey, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 270.

[20] <u>Tantrasāra</u>, 8-9, in B. N. Pandit, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 267, parenthesis added.

a sudden realization preceded only by the aspirant's effort of attention. However, in spite of its name, the teaching of the preceptor is still a Means, which requires that the disciple in this path be at the most advanced level. These four ways are also subsumed under Samāveśa, Abhinava's general term for the merging of dependent experience into the independent one.[21]

Further, a synthesis of this sequence shows that Means-Without-Means is only the highest stage of Śiva-Means, itself the culmination of Divine Power-Means.[22] Thus in practice, Divine Power-Means is a direct way to liberation; it is itself capable of effecting liberation irrespective of its intensification viewed under the different names of Śiva-Means and Means-Without-Means. Hence the realization which the Divine Power Means accomplishes brings a person into the permanent jivanmukti state.

More specifically, the Divine Power-Means requires persistent contemplation accompanied by the right reasoning, the right scriptures and the instruction of the right teacher.[23] This will cause the transcendental uniting knowledge to arise. By the instructions in the Āgamas from the right teacher, a succession of objective impressions of the same nature arises. These are a step toward unity. Through continual contemplation of these equally limited impressions a pure discoursive knowledge

---

[21] Ibid., citing Tantrāloka I, 173.

[22] Pandey, op. cit., pp. 312 and 284; Pandit, op. cit., pp. 270 and 275, citing Mālinī, Vijaya Tantra 2, 23.

[23] Tantrasāra 21, see appendix.

which is unlimited originates. This pure knowledge brings the meditator into the Pure Wisdom category, the interiority of the divine life. Pure knowledge, opposed to empirical cognition, is salvific.

The arising of this transcendental knowledge (right reasoning) comes about through the grace of Lord Śiva. This marks the Kashmiri systems as theistic. The Prabodhapañcadaśikā, the Tantrasāra and the Paramārthasāra treat of grace in these words: Prabodhapañcadaśikā, v. 12--

> . . . Has that (understanding) come about from the taste of grace itself, or from the acquisition of knowledge through a teacher, or by the instruction of the highest Lord?

and Tantrasāra, chapter 4 --

> Consequently, in anyone smitten by the hurl of Śiva's concentrated power, and who has thus achieved liberation, the right reasoning spontaneously arises, and such a one is said to be the initiate of the goddesses.

while Paramārthasāra, v. 9, reads --

> As a face is revealed in a mirror free of impurity, so it (the Self) shines in its radiance in the element of intelligence purified by the visitation of Śiva's power.[24]

The question in the first citation is contextually answered in the following verse (verse 13) as a liberation granted from the highest Lord. The notion of Śiva's "power" in the last citation may be understood as his grace. Thus the divine grace and the emerging of right reasoning are

---

[24]Prabodhapañcadaśikā, Tantrasāra, Paramārthasāra; v. 12, p. 23, v. 9 respectively. See appendix and Barnett, op. cit. Emphases added.

successive. Although this is mostly implicit in the preceding quotations, Abhinava also affirms it explicitly:

> Hence, only those struck by the relentless hurl of Śiva's power, and who have had their discursive knowledge purified in degrees with the aid of the right scriptures and such other means, are able to enter into the Supreme Reality.[25]

Is this grace completely gratuitous or does it depend upon specific actions to evoke it? A probable position is that:

> Only that person develops devotion to God, on whom he casts a gracious glance. His grace, on the other hand, depends on the devotion of a person because he becomes gracious only to His devotees.[26]

Although the complete gratuity of the divine intervention is implied in the notion of Śiva's independence, nevertheless for the devotee seeking liberation a discipline of five spiritual duties is enjoined. The goal and means of this plan are explained in the Tantrasāra:

> . . . right reasoning -- the direct means of realization -- is none other than the category of Pure Wisdom, which is itself realized in many ways: by sacrifice, libation, murmured prayers, vows and yoga.[27]

An initial grace must be enhanced and completed through the undertaking of this pentad of works. In these operations there is a natural gradation from the easiest to the most difficult. Abhinava defines them thus:

> Sacrifice is the offering of all things to the Supreme Lord alone with the purpose of strengthening

---

[25]Tantrasāra, see appendix.

[26]B. N. Pandit, op. cit., p. 280, citing Śiva Stotravali of Utpala, 12, 36 and 4, 10; and Mālinī Vijaya Vārtika I, 697 of Abhinava.

[27]Tantrasāra, see appendix.

the representation that the sole ground of the existence of all things is none but this very Lord, and that nothing exists apart from him. Hence the exterior use of delightful things (like offered flowers and perfumes) is recommended in view of the fact that all such things, through their capacity to delight, are able to enter the consciousness spontaneously: the offering of these to the Supreme Lord is thus easy indeed.

Libation is the dissolution of all things in the blaze of divine consciousness, brought about with the purpose of arriving at the firm idea that all things are constituted of the fire of the Supreme Lord. Conceived as though he were a desire for devouring all that exists, this Lord is the pure blaze that subsists when all the rest has been destroyed.

Prayer is the interior thought that the Supreme Reality exists in and of itself, with no connotation to the differentiated external and internal knowable forms of reality. This thought is undertaken with the purpose of bringing about a knowledge constituted of these two forms.

A vow is the viewing of all things (like bodies and pots), at all places and times, and through the conception of equality with the Supreme Lord for the attainment of the thought of this Lord who is unattainable by any means at all.

Yoga is a definite representation which in essence is the attentive reflection of the very being of the Supreme Reality, for corroborating the conviction that all existence is none other than the Ultimate Reality's external and absolute light. Though this light illuminates through multiple representations, themselves essentially parts of Pure Wisdom, it is nonetheless wholly independent of them.[28]

It is clear, therefore, that these five practices help us realize the category of Pure Wisdom (<u>sadvidyā</u>-<u>tattva</u>), the initial transition to the divine life.

---

[28]<u>Ibid</u>.

(4) ŚAKTI'S ROLE IN LIBERATION

Let us recall that for the Recognition System, a sudden apprehension is the means of liberation and that the immediacy of this intuition need not conflict with the measured steps to the realization which the teaching of Gradualness enjoins. For the Recognition System intuition is:

> . . . an act by which we endeavour to recall and reunite the former states of consciousness and is a kind of reasoning by which we ascend from a present consciousness to a former one. . . . in recognition, though the mental impression is an important factor yet it is not the only factor . . .; it is necessarily always coupled with direct perception of the object which serves as an operating cause.[29]

This operating or recalling of the former state of consciousness before its contraction from God to man, joined with the appearance in contemplation of this same consciousness, is the vision attained in yoga. We shall see that this meditation provides an important context in which the instrumentality of Divine Power for achieving liberation is demonstrated.

Siva's power moreover affects liberation because it is the divine plenitude plerōma[30] (pūrṇatvam) by which man comes to consummate consciousness of himself. In two places Abhinava maintains that Divine Power is the path of descent from God to man and more importantly of the ascent of man to God.[31]

---

[29] Pandey, op. cit., p. 299, emphases added.

[30] Abhinavagupta. Tantrasāra. See appendix.

[31] B. N. Pandit, op. cit., p. 175, citing Parātriṁśika Vivaraṇa. 74, 80 and Tantrāloka Viveka III, 425.

There is also the dialectic of Luminosity-Consciousness (prakāśavimarśa). The first point is luminosity; the second is the vibration of consciousness; the third is the return of luminosity through consciousness as the all-comprehensive "I." In this logical process pure consciousness (śakti) is involved in the reality of pure light (Śiva) to the extent that it enables the latter to realize itself as complete subject, God. One scholar elucidates:

> Śiva comes to recognize His own Lordship only when He knows śakti as His and not something outside of Him. . . . Now consciousness of full egoity is then only possible when He is also conscious of possessing śakti who holds within Her the entire phenomenal world.[32]

Thus, Divine Power is the indispensable instrument for the realization of the divine as most fully self-conscious. Furthermore, even bliss (ānanda) which is properly Śiva's may be intelligible within this dialectic of luminosity-consciousness:

> . . . the experience of bliss . . . is nothing but the experience of identity with the Supreme Principle of Consciousness, the Siva, in indissoluble union with his vibration.[33]

Hence bliss is the resting of Divine Power, Śiva's initial vibration of consciousness, on his own luminosity, the highest principle of his being. The dialectic Śiva-śakti in its concentration on Śiva's subjectivity emphasizes his bliss.

The dialectic of Śiva-śakti most importantly relates to the human condition in contemplation. The Tantrasāra refers

---

[32] S. K. Das. Shakti or Divine Power, University of Calcutta, Calcutta Press, 1934, p. 74.

[33] Pandey, op. cit., p. 688.

to *śakti*'s various designations:

> . . . Family, Efficacy, Undulation, Heart, Essence, Tremor, Magnificence, Lady of the Triads, Kālī, the Temptress, the Terrifying Goddess, Speech, Pleasure, Vision, the Eternal and so on, meaning to imply that she can exist in the heart of those who meditate on her in one or another of these forms.[34]

Abhinava goes on to assert that Śiva's *śaktis* are innumerable, and asks rhetorically how they can be explained. Abhinava's foremost disciple, Kṣemarāja, refers to the phenomenon of the proliferation of *śaktis*:

> *Śakti* reigns throughout the universe by means of the innumerable, subordinate *śaktis* which, arranged in circles, become just as many manifestations of the highest *śakti*.[35]

But as Abhinava explains in his *Tantrasāra*, the infinitude of *śaktis* can be reduced to three or four basic types:

> The totality, however, is comprehended in three powers (*śaktis*) through which the Lord pervades, sees and illumines everything from Śiva down to the earth: (a) through pure consciousness incapable of being represented, that is His Highest Power; (b) through difference-in-identity, of which an elephant reflected in a mirror is an example, that is his Highest-Lowest Power; (c) through difference that is in essence mutual exclusion -- that one is his Lowest Power.[36]

This passage also illustrates three grades of consciousness: the first is that of salvation to be realized; the second is reflection -- secondary reflection, whose divergence from the first is its insistence on seeing the world both as united

---

[34] Abhinavagupta, see appendix.

[35] Kṣemarāja's *Pratyabhijñā Hṛdayam*. Tr. Karl F. Leidecker. Madras: Adyar, 1938, p. 13.

[36] See appendix.

with yet separate from Śiva; the third is an entrenched false consciousness which views the world as quite different from Siva. This is the Self-Obscuration Category (māyā-tattva). Even this last grade of consciousness arises from a part of Śiva's power, indicating both the inclusion of the false within the true and suggesting the dialectical process in which falsity is overcome by truth. It is interesting to note that these grades reflect the three types of Vedantic ontology, non-difference (abheda), identity-in-difference (bhedābheda) and difference (bheda). However, they are all projections of Śiva's visionary and illuminative power, which is at once capable of non-difference and of difference of one sort or another. There is, however, a fourth śakti based on Siva's capacity for destruction which attains to the state of non-difference alone:

> There is also the power by which the Lord devours in himself the triple-moded totality as though in an embrace and through a process of unification; this is his Blessed Highest Power, identified by such names as the Essence of the Mother and Devourer of Time.[37]

In other words, there are two powers (illuminative and destructive) that attain to three states (non-difference, difference-in-identity, and difference); but non-difference (a) can be attained by both creative and destructive powers, while the other two states (b and c) can be attained by the illuminative power alone. The non-difference attaining powers are the

---

[37] Ibid.

Highest and the Blessed Highest, while the Highest-Lowest attains only identity-in-difference, and the Lowest, only difference.

These four powers each spontaneously tripled (according as they are directed towards the creation, preservation and destruction of the universe) become twelve.[38] It is difficult to see how this can apply to the Twelve Śaktis described by Abhinava, and which I shall examine below in section 5. For then four śaktis would have to possess creative functions, four, preservative and four, destructive. It will be found that the Kālīs' activities are mostly destructive; hence, as we shall see, Abhinava himself uses a different classification when he actually comes to the description of the śaktis in detail. Nevertheless, the tripling of the four powers is important in two connections: (1) the conception of Twelve śaktis is common both to the teachings of Gradualness and Suddenness: (2) Abhinava intimates that the Threefold-System, equating with the teaching of Suddenness, also holds this belief in Twelve Śaktis. Since the teaching of Suddenness espouses Means-Without-Means, which is only an intensification of the Threefold System's Śiva-Means,[39] the two can not be adjudged as separate, and the three systems emerge more connected than disjointed.

The purpose of the Twelve Śaktis in the Divine Power

---

[38]Ibid..

[39]Pandey, op. cit., p. 606 citing Tantrāloka I, 182.

Means is the purification of the limited ego in its dichotomous subject-object perception, and the revelation of the true ego as universal self-consciousness. Accordingly, these Twelve Śaktis are the progressive unmasking of Śiva. One scholar puts it:

> . . . the Ultimate, the free, self-luminous and conscious energy manifests itself preponderantly in succession in the forms of twelve kālīs (śaktis) in the experience of the limited subject in consequence of which the individual realizes itself as the universal subject and attains liberation.[40]

This successive contemplative manifestation of Śiva through twelve śaktis is circular:

> These twelve blessed powers, identified by the name Kālī, arise in dyads, triads or in more complex combinations, simultaneously or in succession with regard to many knowing subjects, or to one such subject only. They unwind in wheel form, either exteriorly (through the digits of the moon, the zodiacal constellations and so forth), or interiorly (through objects like jars or cloths), so increasing the Lord of the Wheel's liberty.[41]

This moving circle is like a circle of light, produced by a firebrand whirled with great speed.[42] It is the appearance of Divine Power in consciousness, Śiva's play with his power, the spiritual integration for which the devotee yearns. The Prabodhapañcadaśikā attests one aspect of Śiva's predisposition to this sport:

---

[40] Ibid., adapted from Tantrāloka III, 296, emphasis and parenthesis added. Kālīs or śaktis are goddesses. See Prabodhapañdaśikā v. 5, devī used for śakti. Also Kṣemarāja, op. cit., p. 58.

[41] Abhinavagupta, Tantrasāra, see appendix, emphasis added.

[42] Pandey, op. cit., p. 525, citing Maheśvarananda's Mahārtha Mañjarī, 112, a work of the teaching of Gradualness.

> This god, the Lord, eternally eager for the taste of play with his inexhaustible goddess, simultaneously disposes the wondrous acts of creation and destruction.[43]

The play of Śiva with his power in its circle of twelve subsidiary powers appears in contemplation in such concrete representations as Kālī, the Temptress and the Terrifying Goddess. This is the liberating mandala.

(5) THE TWELVE ŚAKTIS

It is not easy to classify these powers. In the first place not all the Āgamas agree that they are twelve; some declare that they are thirteen. But twelve, resulting as it does from the multiplication of the two sacred numbers 3 and 4 -- is generally agreed upon. The next step is how to justify the number on the basis of notions relevant to the problem of liberation, and we saw how Abhinava tried to do this through the four śaktis (Highest, Highest-Lowest, Lowest and Blessed Highest) and the three functions of the Godhead (creation, maintenance and destruction). We also saw that it was not easy to make Abhinava's actual description of the Twelve Śaktis correspond to this classification. Abhinava left no commentary on the Tantrasāra, so we cannot imagine how he may have worked out his correspondence, but we possess his illustrious interpreter Jayaratha's commentary on the Tantrāloka and there Jayaratha adopts a slightly different classification. "The Supreme Consciousness" he asserts, "assuming the fourfold form of

---

[43] Prabodhapañcadaśikā, v. 6, see appendix.

creation, maintenance, destruction and ineffability, shines always in the knower, the means of knowledge and the known. In other words, through differentiation and quadruplicity it shines twelvefold."[44] The śaktis are thus divided into three groups of four: the first, of the prameya or the known; the second of the pramāṇa or means of knowledge; and the third of the pramātṛ or the knower. The saktis of the prameya that manifest the states of creation, conservation, destruction and ineffability are respectively the Kali of Creation or Sṛṣṭikālī, the Kali of Blood or Raktakālī, the Kali of the Destruction of Stability or Sthitināśakālī and the Kali of the God of Death or Yamakālī. The śaktis of the pramāṇa manifesting those very states are, in order, the Kali of Destruction or Saṁhārakālī, the Kali of Death or Mṛtyukali, the Fearful Kali or Rudrakālī and the Kali of the sun or Martaṇḍakālī. The śaktis of the pramātṛ are, also respectively, the Kali of the Supreme Sun or Paramārkakālī, the Kali of the Fire of Doom or Kalanālārudrakālī, the Kali of the Great Death God or Mahākālakālī and the Furious, Violent and Frightful Kali of the Mighty, Terrifying God or Mahābhairavacaṇḍograghorakālī.

The twelve śaktis are divided into three groups of four. The first group calls attention to Śiva's self-sufficiency and complete power over the individual's existence. Arising from the divine recesses, the four goddesses of this group

---

[44]Viveka on the Tantrāloka, 4 āhnika, 125-273, pp. 127-128.

perform the functions of the limitation of the subject as well as of the creation, maintenance and destruction of empirical objects. The first śakti, the Kali of Creation or Sṛṣṭikālī is creative power. The second, the Kali of Blood or Raktakālī is the power of assuming the means of sensory knowledge, of judgement (buddhi), of the "I" sense (ahaṁkāra) and of the attentive capacity (manas), which however are only the external forms of the subject. This is the sustenation of the empirical individual. The third, the Kali of the Destruction of Stability, or Sthitināśakālī, is the power of the annihilation of the object, which is absorbed into the subject's consciousness through self-contraction. Such a notion presupposes that all aspects of knowledge — subject, object and means — are momentary. Consequently, as soon as the object is known it becomes the content of subjective mind.[45] The fourth, the Kali of the God of Death or Yamakālī allows for the rise of doubt towards an object of experience. It is a self-assumed limitation of the subject, which is then destroyed. These four śaktis produce the potential creation of the individual and the world, their actual creation and maintenance, the reabsorption of the objectivity into the individual, subjective doubt with respect to the objectivity, and finally, the absorption of this doubt.

The second group of four śaktis accentuates the destruction of the individual's means of knowledge. The fifth śakti, the Kali of Destruction or Saṁhārakali terminates the

[45] Pandey, op. cit., p. 515.

apprehension of objectivity as dependent on the means of knowledge. The resultant understanding views the object as interiorly grasped within the subject (<u>puruṣa</u>), and is expressed in the notion "The objects of experience are non-different from me."[46] The sixth śakti, the Kali of Death or Mṛtyukālī, is an even stronger power than the fifth. She goes beyond the non-dual relation of the object to the subject and makes the object merge into the subject. The seventh sakti, the Fearful Kali or Rudrakālī, generates the subject with a relation towards a mental object. She is discoursive, and still on the level of duality, although the group to which she belongs is in process towards unity. The <u>Tantrasāra</u> reads:

> Can the Supreme Reality, you might ask, be the subject of discursive representation? The answer is no: the work of such a representation ends when the impression of duality is destroyed. As for the Supreme Reality itself -- in all places self-luminous by its very essence -- representation serves no purpose at all, helpful or harmful.[47]

Consequently the seventh śakti, embodying as she does a discursive relation, lessens the transcendental integrity of her group. The eighth śakti, the Kali of the Sun or Martāṇḍakālī, effects the identification of the five perceptual capacities (<u>jñānendriyas</u>), the five active capacities (<u>karmendriyas</u>), the attentive capacity (<u>manas</u>), and judgement (<u>buddhi</u>) with the "I" sense (<u>ahaṁkāra</u>), so that only a concentration in the "I" sense remains. Now the perception as "I" exists neither in

---

46<u>Ibid.</u>, p. 516, citing <u>Tantrāloka</u> III, 167.

47<u>Tantrasāra</u>, see appendix.

the empirical nor in the transcendental sense, but in a reorientation of the first towards the second. Through the Fearful Kali's achievement of the partial involution of categories, the self becomes poised for their complete involution. This is a preparatory stage for the full realization accomplished by the following group of śaktis.

This last or third and most transcendental group of four śaktis engenders liberation through the destruction of the limited subject. The ninth śakti, the Kali of the Supreme Sun or Paramārkakālī, causes the merging of the "I" sense into the limited subject. The tenth śakti, the Terrifying Kali of the Fire of Doom or Kālānalārudrakālī, produces the identification of the limited self and God as expressed in the sentence, "I am all this."[48] This is the Pure Wisdom Category of Śiva's transcendental life. The eleventh, the Kali of the Great Death God or Mahākālakālī, is the experience of "I am all this", with the object having so fused with the subject that the "I" is almost completely self-sufficient. This is the transcendental Category of Incipient Empirical Being. Finally, the twelfth, the Furious, Violent and Frightful Kali of the Mighty Terrifying God or Mahābhairavacaṇḍograghorakālī, is the ineffable vibration of Śiva, the liberating vision of one's own divinity, through which the Category of Divine Power is attained.

Interestingly, the three groups of śaktis begin with

---

[48]Pandey, op. cit., p. 519 citing Tantrāloka III, 117.

a preponderant emphasis on the divine, proceed to the destruction of the means of empirical knowledge and return to the original emphasis. Thus the wheel of the Twelve Śaktis, in addition to revolving circularly in contemplative vision, also theoretically comes "full circle."

Kṣemarāja also speaks of how these goddesses

> in unity . . . unfold the great sphere of avikalpa which consists in the ingress into the blissful.[49]

If one remembers that "in anyone smitten by the hurl of Śiva's concentrated power . . . the right reasoning spontaneously arises and such a one is said to be the initiate of the goddesses,"[50] then it is clear that this circular manifestation of Twelve Śaktis is Śiva's descent of grace.

This professedly spiritual integration reminds one of a similar psychological pattern within Śaivism. The Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad relates that "the greatness of the self-luminous Lord causes the wheel of Brahman to revolve."[51] This shows that the circular succession of Twelve Śaktis in the Tantrasāra is not the first time that Śiva has been connected with a circle.

In Carl G. Jung there are five interesting parallels to the above doctrine. First, there are the

> . . . mythological motifs . . . that form in themselves a multiplicity but this culminates in a concentric or radial order which constitutes the true center or

---

[49]Op. cit., p. 58; avikalpa is non-discursiveness.

[50]Tantrasāra, see appendix.

[51]Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad VI, 1. Tr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan. The Principal Upaniṣads. London: Allen and Unwin, 1968, p. 743.

> essence of the collective unconscious. On account of the remarkable agreement between the insights of yoga and the results of psychological research (says Jung), I have chosen the Sanskrit term <u>mandala</u> for this central symbol.[52]

This recalls the wheel of the Twelve Śaktis. Second, is the collective unconscious that is the womb of all psychic processes, which constantly strives to redirect these functions into their former ways.[53] Its existence means that individual consciousness is susceptible to predetermining influences. Since the collective unconscious is both the origin of individual consciousness and a lasting value in its functioning, the former must excel the latter. It is therefore a psychic dimension "above" individual consciousness, a higher consciousness.

Similarly, the first Category of the Threefold System—Siva—is the matrix of the twelfth Category, of the Limited Individual or <u>puruṣa</u>. Moreover, since Śiva through his Divine Power category is the giver of grace, he is also a perduring influence in man's life. In this connection also the Recognition System teaches the ascent from a present to a former consciousness which is similar to the redirection of conscious processes by the collective unconscious.

Third, is the ego which can be no more than the center of the field of consciousness, and

---

[52] Collected Works. XI <u>Psychology and Religion East and West</u>. Bollingen, Princeton, 1969, p. 573.

[53] Collected Works VIII <u>The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche</u>. Princeton, 1960, p. 112.

> . . . just as consciousness arises from the unconscious, the ego-center, too, crystallizes out of a dark depth in which it was somehow contained <u>in potentia</u>.[54]

This approximates the self-veiling of divinity whereby Siva becomes man, for in that action the latent limited self becomes actual.

Fourth, is the intuition which comes from the activity of the unconscious. It is a process which results in the breaking into consciousness of an unconscious content.[55] Abhinava's concept of right reasoning (true intuition) is also a spontaneous irruption into consciousness: it is the Pure Wisdom Category which had become unconscious through <u>māyā</u>'s obscuring power, but then suddenly flashes into consciousness in the circle of Twelve Śaktis. Therefore Abhinava's "right reasoning" is similar to Jung's "intuition."

Fifth, are the symbols of psychological self-realization of which the most important are:

> . . . geometrical figures containing elements of the circle and quaternity. (The circle has the character of wholeness because of its "perfect" form; the quaternity, because four is the minimum number of parts into which the circle may naturally be divided.) . . . A special variant of the quaternity motif is the dilemma of 3 and 1. Twelve (3x4) seems to belong here as a solution of the dilemma and as a symbol of wholeness (zodiac, year). . . . The complement of the quaternity is unity.[56]

May this not be applied to the Twelve Śaktis of the Divine

---

[54] <u>Collected Works XI</u>, p. 281.

[55] <u>Collected Works VIII</u>, p. 132.

[56] <u>Collected Works IX</u>, 2 <u>Aion</u>: <u>Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self</u>. Princeton, 1970, p. 224.

Power Means? They are circular; they are initially three -- Highest, Highest-Lowest and Lowest -- to which a fourth, the Blessed Highest, is added, giving the precise variant of 3 and 1; they become twelve — also an exact parallel. Accordingly, we can take the Twelve Śaktis as constituting a symbol of psychological self-realization.

Three further similarities exist. First, Jung writes that one topic of his work is "the sequence of fantasies produced by deliberate concentration."[57] In Abhinava's Divine Power Means a specific discipline of such meditation is enjoined. Second, Jung remarks:

> The "squaring of the circle" is one of the many archetypal motifs which form the basic patterns of our dreams and fantasies. . . . it could even be called the archetype of wholeness. Because of this significance, the "quaternity of the One" is the schema for all the images of God. . . .[58]

In Abhinava's postulation of specifically four _śaktis_ of the Lord this "quaternity of the One" abides. Third, the whirling of mandalas as Jung understands it, is similar to the rotation of the _śaktis_; both are circular and successive. This use of psychological research is important in demonstrating the attainment of the self's integrity. Abhinava's term for this is "illumination", Jung's is "individuation." Both deal with self-realization, though Abhinava's treatment is more patently theological.

---

[57] _Ibid._, _IX_, _Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious_, 49. Princeton, 1959, p. 49.

[58] _Ibid._, p. 338.

Abhinava's Divine Power Means is theologically profound, and the cogent resonances found in Jung's work illustrate its psychological side.

(6) INTUITION (PRATIBHĀ)

Another aspect of the attainment of liberation is intuition (pratibhā). Intuition comprises two poles of consciousness, non-imaginative and imaginative. In the Tantrāloka Abhinava has the phrase śambhava pratibhātmani[59]-- "to Śiva whose essence is intuition." He defines intuition in its non-imaginative side as the power of knowing the unsensed and untaught which is not acquired through any external means,[60] but is self-evident. It belongs in a dormant sense to judgement (buddhi) and in an active sense to man (puruṣa). The former characterized by its non-subjective apprehension of external objects becomes the latter when objects are discerned subjectively. In other words, intuition has two aspects, apparent and real. As the first it is consciousness affected by a variety of objects in a temporal-spatial order, just as a mirror is affected by the objects reflected in it. As the second it is consciousness without a temporal-spatial succession of objects, just as a mirror properly lacks such a sequence despite the many objects reflected on it. Accordingly, intuition,

---

[59]Cited in Pandey, op. cit., p. 692, quoting Commentary of Jayaratha on Tantrāloka, āhnika 13,100.

[60]Ibid., citing Tantrāloka 13,87.

because it is this understanding of the objectivity as merged with the subject, is a transcendental dimension of man.

Abhinava elaborates intuition's spiritual nature; he asserts that the individual in whom intuition has arisen, ascends to the level of the Pure Wisdom Category, although still possessed of both external and internal senses.[61] Abhinava also states that Pure Wisdom allows an individual a non-dual understanding of objectivity.[62] Since both intuition and Pure Wisdom accomplish the fusing of objectivity with the subject, they are identical.

Intuition is also discussed in its imaginative form. It is maintained that in free imagination, such as the poetic, the images which arise are due neither to external stimuli, to remembrance, nor to revived past ideas; rather they are due to the manifestation of free will.[63] Imagination is thus a self-evident function of free will which is, it will be recalled, Śiva's independence. It unites the individual and Śiva in three ways: (1) By participation of man's imagination in Śiva's.[64] (2) By imagination's power to create new images and to objectify them. Just as Intelligence has furnished through its self-veiling something new within itself, and then

---

[61] Ibid., p. 699, citing Tantrāloka, 13, 120-121.

[62] Ibid., p. 700, citing Bhāskarī (Abhinava's commentary on Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vimarśinī) II, 230.

[63] Ibid., citing Bhāskarī I, 338.

[64] Ibid.

objectified it (for instance, man), so also the individual through imagination has furnished in his mind something new and then objectified it (for instance, a poem). (3) By imagination's power to understand the unity of Śiva and man through the elimination of duality. Since man understands that his own imagination can concretize exteriorly something which is really interior, he also realizes that Śiva can operate in a similar fashion. In Śiva's action however, the concretion is man and the world, which are really one with Siva. Therefore, through the endowment of the imagination man has the capacity for non-dual knowledge.

Furthermore, intuition is synonymous with pure consciousness (vimarśa),[65] which manifests externally what exists in Śiva internally. Thus Intuition also uncovers externally the self-evident imagination which is man's internal point of union with Śiva, thus possessing the integrating, liberating function which is peculiarly the Divine Power's. Indeed, in the teaching of Gradualness, intuition reveals itself in the forms of twelve goddesses.[66] This brings it decisively into the Divine Power Means whose Twelve Śaktis constitute Siva's power. In addition, one scholar states that the mandala, in which these goddesses appear has

> . . . the creative purpose of giving expression

---

[65] Ibid., p. 700, citing Tantrāloka X, 143.

[66] Ibid., p. 703, citing Tantrāloka I, 157-158.

> and form to something that does not exist, something new and unique.[67]

This is precisely what has been predicated of the imaginative pole of intuition. Hence from Abhinava's own pen and from parallel psychological insight, one may conclude that intuition is the Divine Power which is most evident, as I said, in the Pure Wisdom Category. Lastly, intuition has a self-presentative character which reveals both the nature of Śiva and of man.

This manifestation of man's true self is the spiritual marriage of Śiva to his power, which is the vision of Siva mediated through his power in contemplation. It is the joy of utter inactivity and desirelessness, the Self-containment which is bliss. Significantly, it is only through the embrace of the Divine Power that liberation is attained. Such an idea is well expressed in the Vijñāna Bhairava, a Śaiva Āgama known to Abhinava, which calls the Divine Power, "the face of Śiva."[68]

For Abhinava, then, Divine Power is the vibration of Śiva whereby he becomes fully conscious to himself. It is his reflection and mirrors man and the world within itself. It is the mediator between Siva's distorted consciousness — puruṣa — and his original consciousness -- Śiva — through which man recognizes his full reality as the divine. It is finally the vision of bliss given in contemplative discipline. Therefore

---

[67]J. Freeman, dd. Man and His Symbols. N. Y., Dell, 1970, p. 247.

[68]20-21, cited in B. N. Pandit, op. cit., p. 239.

Divine Power exercises a double function — it shatters the self-assumed limitation of non-intuition and thus leads man to recognize himself as the divine, and it brings Śiva to the plenitude of consciousness through this fruition of his own divinity.

CHAPTER III

THE AESTHETIC ASPECT OF DIVINE POWER (ŚAKTI)

स्थायी प्रबुद्धहृदये व्यभिचारिभूतः
कामाकुलासु जनतासु महानुभावः ।
अन्तर्विभावविषयो रसमात्रमूर्तिः
श्रीमान् प्रसन्नहृदयोऽस्तु मम त्रिनेत्रः ॥

Abhinava Bhāratī 7;
maṅgala śloka

May the noble Śiva, the three-eyed God, Pure Sentiment incarnate, the Permanent Emotion become Transient Feeling to the awakened heart, the Great Consequent to those confused by desire and the object of the Inner Determinant, be propitious towards me.

It is Abhinavagupta's further insight that man can attain Śiva's Divine Power — and hence, liberation — through the aesthetic experience of peace (śāntarasa). Before considering Abhinava's remarks on the aesthetic path to liberation, it is first necessary to understand Śiva's traditional aesthetic connections. For unless Śiva is prominent in India's artistic beginnings, Abhinava's elaboration of the aesthetic aspect of his Divine Power is futile.

(1) ŚIVA'S TRADITIONAL ASSOCIATION WITH THE DRAMA

The classical account of the drama's origin is the fourth chapter of Bharata's Treatise on Drama (Nāṭyaśāstra), which dates between 100 B. C. and A. D. 200.[1] Significantly the first chapter of this work discusses the dance. But the god of the dance is Śiva. Therefore the priority of the dance lends equal supremacy to Śiva. Bharata's fourth chapter also treats of Śiva's prominence, for it presents the god Brahmā imploring Śiva to adorn the former's new creation, the drama. Thus, Śiva's creation of the dance precedes the creation of the drama. Moreover, Brahmā's attempt to incorporate the qualities of Śiva's production into his own composition demonstrates the superiority both of Śiva to Brahmā and also of the dance to the drama in their original forms.

In the same chapter Bharata with his one hundred sons and disciples address Brahmā:

> Lord, command quickly what performance should be enacted. Perform The Churning of the Ocean (Amṛta Manthana). . . . Let this drama, my composition, be enacted. Sometime later Brahma said: We shall produce this dance (Nāṭya) before the three-eyed God, Śiva.[2]

In this verse there are two important facts which, we shall see, sustain Śiva's priority: (1) the composition which Brahmā

---

[1] M. V. Kane. History of Sanskrit Poetics. Third Revised Edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1961, p. 47.

[2] Nāṭyaśāstra, verse 5. Tāndava Lakṣanam: The Fundamentals of Ancient Hindu Dancing. Tr., V. N. Naidu. Madras: G. S. Press, 1936, p. 17, emended.

wishes enacted is The Churning of the Ocean; (2) the performance itself is termed nāṭya. To take the first fact in the Rāmāyaṇa version of The Churning of the Ocean, Śiva is the hero of the episode. The rival sons of Diti and Aditi, who wish to obtain an immortal potion produce nectar from the churning of the ocean of milk. However the serpent Vāsuki, who is used as the rope in the course of this churning, vomits a fiery poison. Then the gods implore Śiva to save them from this portent:

> The deities, seeking as their refuge the great god, went to Rudra and praised him (calling out) "deliver us, deliver us." Then, being urged by the gods, Viṣṇu . . . said to Rudra, the wielder of the trident: "What has first appeared when the ocean was churned by the gods belongs to you, most eminent one, because you are our Lord. . . . "After Śiva perceived the alarm of the deities and heard Viṣṇu's words, he took the deadly poison as if it had been nectar. Then he dismissed the gods and departed.[3]

This episode has two significant points: Viṣṇu acknowledges that Śiva is the supreme god and Śiva saves the (as yet not immortal) gods from death. In another interpretation of this chapter Brahmā presents a second drama which is associated with Śiva:

> . . . this Samavakāra named The Churning of the Ocean as well as a Ḍima named The Burning of the Triple Town (Tripuradāha) will be performed in the Himalaya region . . .[4]

---

[3]Bala Kanda, vv. 21-25 in John Muir. Original Sanskrit Texts in the Origin and History of the People of India, Their Religion and Institutions. London: Trubner and Company, 1872, IV, pp. 365-366, parentheses added (from Rāmāyaṇa).

[4]Nāṭyaśāstra, vv. 9-10. M. Ghosh, Tr., second edition. Calcutta: Manisha Granthalaya, 1967, pp. 45-46, emended. Samavakāra is one of the ten types of Sanskrit drama. A Ḍima is a play of the major type.

This refers to Śiva's destruction of the triple city referred to in Chapter I.[5] Both dramas glorify Śiva.

Second, nāṭya means either "dance in its perfection" or "drama in its totality."[6] Since these are identical, drama is actually the fruition of the dance, its origin. Consequently, because Śiva is the god of dance, he is also indirectly the god of drama.

Interestingly, the three Sanskrit words for "dance" show a marked evolution from simple to complex. Thus, nṛtta means "just dance"; nṛtya, gesture and dance; and nāṭya, gesture, dance and music.[7] Another definition is a "combination of both dancing and acting."[8] In addition the Viṣṇu Parvan of the Mahābhārata has the phrase, nāṭakaṁ nanṛtuḥ ("they danced a play").[9] Accordingly it is clear that Brahmā's use of nāṭya itself demonstrates the indispensable connection of drama with the dance. It also accentuates Śiva's pre-eminence in the creation of the drama. Although Brahmā is the technical originator of the drama, its real basis, the dance, has Śiva as its god.

---

[5]See chapter one of this thesis, note 13; from Karṇa Parvan of the Mahābhārata.

[6]D. R. Mankhad. The Types of Sanskrit Drama. Karachi, 1936, p. 22.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Enakshi Bhavanani. The Dance in India. Bombay: Taraporevala, 1925, p. 21.

[9]M. Ghosh, op. cit., xxvi, citing chapter 93, p. 28, the Harivaṁśa.

Again, the Treatise on Drama, chapter four, narrates Brahmā's obeisance to Śiva:

> After Brahmā, accompanied by the retinue of gods, proceeded to Śiva's home, he worshipped him and said; O Best of Gods! Please hear and see this Samavakāra which I have produced.[10]

It also tells of Brahmā's request that Śiva teach him a particular bodily gesture and Śiva's gracious acceding to that petition:

> . . . On hearing Śiva, Brahmā replied, "O Chief of gods, teach us the performance of Aṅgaharas (the movement of the whole body from one place to another). Therefore Śiva called Taṇḍu and said, "Initiate Bharata in the performance of the Aṅgaharas."[11]

It was Taṇḍu who gave his name to Śiva's violent dance, the Tāṇḍava.

Because the origin of the drama lies in the dance which is Śiva's bailiwick, it is helpful to describe at least one of his dances. Traditionally, Śiva has a violent dance (Tāṇḍava), a yogic dance and a gift-giving dance.[12] One opinion is that all three symbolically represent the manifestation of primeval energy and release from the ego's illusions.[13] The Hymn to Śiva at Evening (Śiva Pradoṣa Stotra) describes Śiva's grace-giving dance performed on Mount Kailāsa. It is a dance of calm and beauty; the sun is setting while a contemplative stillness lies on the world:

---

[10] V. N. Naidu, Tr., op. cit., vv. 6-7, p. 17, emended.

[11] Ibid., vv. 16-17, p. 17, emended.

[12] E. Bhavnani, op. cit., p. 5.

[13] Cited in Ananda Coomaraswamy. The Dance of Śiva. Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1948, p. 84.

> Sarasvatī plays the Vina, Indra, the flute, Brahmā holds the time-marking cymbals, Lakṣmi begins a song, Viṣnu beats a drum and all the gods stand about. Śivȧ dances with divine almost expressionless face, calling to his followers to worship Him with peace in their hearts. At His feet. . . . only peace and the beauty of contemplation.[14]

This dance symbolizes the granting of spiritual bliss to those devotees who attempt to realize Śiva in meditation. Therefore there is at least a partial contemplative basis in Śiva's dances for a contemplative aspect of drama.

The historical formation of the drama as well as the earliest plays also attest drama's genesis in the dance. The actor was originally a dancer (in the sense of nṛtya), xrepresenting by his postures and gestures various emotions. In short, he was a pantomine.[15] A. B. Keith holds that the use of epic recitations evoked the latent possibilities of drama and crystallized it as a literary form.[16] For him, it was this combination of the pantomine and epic recitations which created the drama as a technique. Its inception dates from the middle of the second to the beginning of the first century B. C.[17] Keith also maintains that the legend in which Kṛṣṇa defeats the wrestlers of his uncle's court and then slays his uncle (Kaṅsa) was crucial to the formation of the early drama.

---

[14] Ibid., emended.

[15] E. Windisch. Geschicte der Sanskritische Philologie und Altertums Kunde. Strassburg: Trubner, 1917-1920. I, p. 398ff.

[16] A. B. Keith. The Sanskrit Drama. London: Oxford University Press, 1924, p. 57.

[17] Ibid., p. 45.

Accordingly, for him, this formative influence explains Bhāsa's hymns (A. D. 350) to Kṛṣṇa in his prefaces whereas the later classical dramatists -- Kālidāsa, Harṣa and Bhavabhūti -- adore Śiva in theirs. Indeed Kālidāsa's Mālavikāgnimitra even introduces a dance-master who alludes to Śiva's creation of the dance and its intimate connection with drama.[18] This hearkening back to Śiva's preeminent association with the drama, as articulated in the Treatise on Drama, may have been an attempt to minimize the formative Vaiṣṇava influence which Bhāsa had acknowledged.

Further, the earliest known Indian dramas belong to religious Buddhist literature:

> Among the fragments discovered at Turfān part of the last act of a play about the conversion of Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana, two of Buddha's first disciples, has been identified. The last sheet of the fragment bears the title Śāriputra-prakaraṇa and the author's name, Aśvaghoṣa.[19]

These fragments date from the second century A. D.[20] Hence the drama originates in Śiva's dance which has definite religious ramifications and also -- as a properly artistic form -- it begins with the portrayal of a religious theme, albeit Buddhist.

---

[18] Ibid., p. 42. Aśvaghoṣa also wrote the first poem, the Buddhacarita, since the ascription of the Rāmāyaṇa to Vālmīki is a reverent tradition and not historical fact.

[19] Paul Masson-Oursel and others. Ancient India and Indian Civilization. London: Kegan Paul, 1934, p. 301.

[20] E. Winternitz. A History of Indian Literature. N. Y.: Russell and Russell, 1933.

(2) THE PEACE EMPHASIS IN TWO SAIVA SCULPTURES

Śiva's aesthetic association and its emphasis on peace (śānta) appear in a second art form -- sculpture. This is particularly evident in the South Indian bronze sculptures of the Lord of the Dance (Naṭarāja) and the Elephanta rock sculpture of the Great Lord (Maheśamūrti).

The twelfth-century bronzes of the Lord of the Dance describe Śiva's tāṇḍava. In his upper right hand the four-armed god carries a little drum, shaped like an hour glass. In Heinrich Zimmer's opinion this represents Speech (Vāk), the means of revelation.[21] The upper left hand bears fire on its palm, representing the destruction of the world. The second right hand is poised in the "fear-not" gesture, suggestive of protection and peace while the second left hand lifted across the chest points downward to the raised left foot. This foot signifies liberation from the cycle of saṁsāra. The right foot is planted firmly on the prostrate body of a demon which symbolizes man's ignorance, binding him to transmigration.[22] Hence Śiva dances atop man's ignorance and beckons him to seek release. This is attained by worshipping Śiva's feet which can destroy man's spiritual blindness. The worship of Śiva's feet means humility and constant prayer for liberating grace.

---

[21] Heinrich Zimmer, Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilization. N. Y.: Harper Torchbooks, 1962, p. 151.

[22] Ibid., pp. 152-153. For a different view on Śiva Naṭarāja see José Pereira:"The Nāṭarāja Theme: A New Interpretation", Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bombay, 1955.

Moreover, according to Zimmer, the positioning of the hands and feet represents Śiva's five divine activities. His upper right hand indicates his self-expression which is creation: his lower right hand counsels faith during the preservation of creation; and his upper left hand suggests destruction. His right foot firmly placed on the head of man's ignorance represents Śiva's own concealment while his uplifted foot points to man's liberation from this blindness. In addition, his lower right hand which both belongs to the complete configuration of the four hands and points to the uplifted left foot connects Śiva's three cosmic functions with his two personal ones.[23]

In the arranging of Śiva's limbs the pulsating sense of motion is striking while the expression on his face suggests the complete cessation of motion. The theme is Śiva's transcendent peace which supercedes his five immanent functions. Zimmer analyzes this contrast of motion and rest:

> Steeped in quietude, the enigmatic mask resides above the whirl of the four resilient arms. . . . This head . . . . abides in transcendental isolation, as a spectator unconcerned. Its smile. . . . filled with the bliss of self-absorption, subtly refutes, with a scarcely hidden irony, the meaningful gestures of the hands and feet. A tension exists between the marvel of the dance and the serene tranquillity of this expressively inexpressive countenance, the tension . . . . of Eternity and Time. . . .[24]

Doubtless, the sculptor is impressing his viewer with God's peace.

---

[23]Ibid., p. 155.

[24]Ibid., p. 166.

The celebrated rock sculpture of the Great Lord of Elephanta is a sixth century work which represents a four faced _liṅga_ with Śiva's five faces later read into it by taking the _glans_ of the phallus which shoots above the crowns of the other faces as the fifth face. These five faces are named Īśāna-Sadāśiva (identical with the _glans_), Aghora-Bhairava, Tatpuruṣa-Mahādeva, Vāmadeva-Umā and Sadyojāta-Nandin, the last four affixed to the _linga's_ sides. But in a bas-relief like Elephanta only three heads can be represented, and the sculptor chose to depict Aghora-Bhairava (to the spectator's left in the Elephanta panel), Tatpuruṣa-Mahādeva (center) and Vāmadeva-Umā (right). The Maheśamurti (Great Lord) theme is beloved of those art critics who are given to reading abstruse theosophical significance in works of Indian art; one such is Heinrich Zimmer, whose interpretation of the Elephanta panel is as follows. It supposedly illustrates the evolution of the One into phenomenal multiplicity which is embodied in the male-female polarity. The sculpture includes three heads: the central head itself (says Zimmer) personifies the Absolute. It is majestic and sublime, the divine basis for the natural manifestations of male and female. To its right is the male visage which has a haughty contracted forehead and chin as well as a twirled moustache. To its left is the female profile which is more gentle; it both allures and enchants. Regarding the central form, Zimmer's interpretation is useful:

> The middle head is self-enclosed in a sublime . . . aloofness. By its impassivity it silences the two

> gestures to right and to left, ignoring completely the display of their antagonistic features. . . . As an immovable, massive, central form, magnificent, self-absorbed in lofty . . . silence, it overpowers, dissolves and fuses into itself the characteristic features of the two lateral physiognomies: Power and sweetness, aggressive vigor and expectant receptivity. Great with transcendental quietude, comprehensive, enigmatic, it subsumes them and annihilates in eternal rest the effects of this creative tension.[25]

The master of Elephanta successfully conveys supernatural stillness.

Therefore, in both Śaiva sculptures, the eternal absorbs the transient. The Absolute is shown as totally oblivious of the phenomenal, despite its casual relationship. Śiva abides in tranquil self-reflection. This peace emphasis will again emerge in a different form in Abhinavagupta's commentary on Bharata's Treatise on Drama (the Abhinava Bhārati).

(3) BHARATA'S RASASŪTRA AND THREE INTERPRETATIONS

Having shown Siva's links with India's artistic beginnings and beyond, let us now turn to the origins of aesthetic reflection. For Abhinava's later refinement in this area requires a scrutiny of its rudiments.

Bharata's Treatise on Drama VI, 31, is the point of departure for aesthetic speculation:

> na hi rasād rte kaścid arthah pravartate. For without rasa (sentiment) there can be no true meaning. (That is no real poetry.)

---

[25]Ibid., p. 149.

> vibhavānubhavavyabhicārisamyogādrasanispattih. Rasa comes from a combination of the determinants, consequents and transient emotions.[26]

The second line, traditionally called the rasasūtra, gives three technical terms and implies a fourth. This last is the "permanent emotion" (sthāyibhāva), a state which abides throughout one's life. The "determinant" (vibhāva) is twofold: the "subject" (ālambana) and the "illuminant" (uddīpana). It is the physical cause evoking the permanent emotion in the spectator. It affects the permanent emotion by imbuing it with a particular coloring. For instance, in Kālidāsa's Abhijñānaśākuntalam, popularly known as the Śakuntalā, there are two subject determinants, the lovers Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā. Two illuminant determinants are also present: the season of spring and the glow of moonlight. The mutual love of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā as well as spring and moonlight determine the spectator's focusing on the permanent emotion -- love -- as it is demonstrated in this particular relationship. The "consequent" (anubhāva) is the actor's gestures which represent his interior state. For instance, in the same play two consequents are the trembling and sweating of Śakuntalā, expressive of her love for Duṣyanta. The "transient emotion" (vyabhicāribhāva) accompanies the actor's permanent emotion. In the same play Duṣyanta's longing for Śakuntalā is a transient emotion.[27]

---

[26] J. L. Masson and M. V. Patwardhan, Trs. Aesthetic Rapture I. Deccan College, Poona, 1970, p. 46. See also Jagannātha's Rasagaṅgādhara, first ānana, pp. 21-22.

[27] Ibid., II, p. 17 note 115, "Bharata often uses the word kāvya when he refers to a drama." A. B. Keith, op. cit.,

Bharata lists eight permanent emotions: love (rati), laughter (hāsa), sorrow (śoka), anger (krodha), dynamic energy (utsāha), fear (bhaya), disgust (jugupsā) and wonder (vismaya).[28] There are also eight corresponding sentiments: erotic (śṛṅgāra), comic (hāsya), compassionate (karuṇa), furious (raudra), heroic (vīra), terrifying (bhayānaka), disgusting (bībhatsa) and awesome (adbhuta).[29] Later aestheticians state that the sentiment which arises from its parallel permanent emotion is not a personal emotional experience but rather an impersonal intuition of the ground of one's consciousness. Accordingly, the determinants, consequents and transient emotions relating to the permanent emotions which are personal, merge to produce the impersonal sentiments. Since, however, Bharata himself did not explain the state of sentiment, but only allowed that it issues from the aforsaid combination, this experience remained open to elucidation.

Three important rasa-interpretations subsequently arose. They are found both in Abhinavagupta's Commentary on the Treatise on Drama (Abhinava Bhāratī) and in Mammaṭa's eleventh century Light of Poetry (Kāvyaprakāśa). First, is the interpretation

---

p. 294: The development of a theory of drama progressed in the closest relation to the general theory of poetics, for the Indian theory of poetry does not admit any distinction in essence between the aesthetic pleasure produced by the drama and any other form of poetry.

[28] Ibid., p. 44, authors' translation: Nāṭyaśāstra VI, 17.

[29] Ibid.

of Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa, a ninth-century Kashmiri, who holds that sentiment is primarily generated in the impersonated character and secondarily recognized in the impersonating actor.[30] Rasa is simply the spectator's perception of the character's permanent emotion, as portrayed by the actor. This perception need not be intensified by the determinants, consequents and transient emotions, although it may be so heightened.

Second, that of Śaṅkuka, also a ninth-century Kashmiri, who criticizes Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa and offers another view. Sentiment cannot merely be the perception of the permanent emotion irrespective of the determinants, consequents and transient emotions, because it is precisely through these three modes that a permanent emotion comes to be known. Sentiment is dependent on the determinants, consequents and transient emotions; but the permanent emotion is closely connected with sentiment. Therefore the permanent emotion must also be closely connected with the determinants, consequents and transient emotions.[31] Śaṅkuka objects that if Lollaṭa's assessment of sentiment as the perception of the permanent emotion is correct, then Bharata should first have explained the permanent emotions and the sentiments afterwards. But Bharata defines the sentiments in chapter six of his treatise and then only in chapter seven does he expound the permanent emotions. Therefore the order of

---

[30]Kāvyaprakāśa. Tr. G. Jha. Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Varanasi, no date, p. 55.

[31]Raniero Gnoli. The Aesthetic Experience According to Abhinavagupta. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Volume LXII, 1968, Varanasi, p. 26.

his considerations -- both indicates the ancillary place of the permanent emotions and the priority of the sentiments, and emphasizes their separate realities.

Śaṅkuka's own view is that sentiment is the perception of the actor's reproduction (anukaraṇa) of the character's permanent emotion heightened by the three aesthetic modes.[32] The spectator can directly realize the determinants, consequents and transient emotions but he may only infer the permanent emotion. Śaṅkuka thus gives a rationalistic turn to sentiment, for inference, unlike perception, is not an immediate experience but a deliberative and gradual one. Against Śaṅkuka's theory the following objection is made which, to my knowledge, has not been answered. The consciousness of a reproduction presupposes a perception both of the original and of the copy. But as the actor can never have perceived the original character's permanent emotion he will be incapable of reproducing it in a drama.[33] For instance, in dramatizing the fourth act of the Śakuntalā -- in which Kaṅva bids farewell to his adopted daughter Śakuntalā -- the actor, not having seen Kaṅva, cannot reproduce his sorrow.

Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka presents a third view: the identification of the spectator with the actor, which is called "generalization":

> Rasa is revealed by a special power assumed by words in poetry and drama, the power of revelation . . . consisting of the action of generalizing the deter-

---

[32]Ibid., p. 27.

[33]Ibid., p. 34.

> minants, etc. . . . This enjoyment is characterized by a resting in one's own consciousness, which due to the emergent state of sattva is pervaded by beatitude and light, and is similar to the tasting of the supreme brahman.[34]

This motion of the de-individualization or impersonalization of the determinants, consequents and transient emotions and of resting in one's own self is significant for it both eclipses the first two views and sets the stage for a sustained treatment of the subject's aesthetic sensibility. Consequently it is an important influence on Abhinavagupta's rasa-theory. The other major force that shaped the ācārya's aesthetic speculation is Ānandavardhana's theory of suggestion (dhvani).

(4) ANANDAVARDHANA'S DHVANI THEORY

Ānandavardhana's doctrine of dhvani expounded in his celebrated Dhvanyāloka (Treatise on the Theory of Suggestion) is an important contribution both to aesthetics generally and to Abhinavagupta's thought in particular. Naturally it attracted both adherents and opponents. The former include among others Mammaṭa, Viśvanātha and Jagannātha. The latter number at least the Naiyāyikas logicians, Kuntaka and Mahimabhaṭṭa.

Ānandavardhana distinguishes three powers of words: denotation, indication or the secondary power, and suggestion. The first, denotation, arouses a conventional image in the

---

[34] Ibid., pp. 45-48.

hearer's mind due to the traditional association of a specific word with its corresponding image. Only the definite conventional sense is rendered by denotation. For example, the word kusuma denotes a flower. The second, indication, removes the defect of apparently contradictory meanings by evoking additional ideas to clarify the apparent inconsistencies. For example, in the sentence, "the village on the Ganges", (gaṅgāyām ghoṣaḥ) indication evokes the additional idea of the bank on which the village is situated. The third, suggestion, is the implied sense of words.[35] In Ānandavardhana's words:

> That kind of poetry, wherein either the (conventional) meaning or the (conventional) word renders itself or its meaning secondary (respectively) and suggests the Implied meaning is designated by the learned as Dhvani or Suggestive Poetry.[36]

In the example, "the village on the Ganges" suggestion uncovers the speaker's purpose as conveying the idea of the coolness and holiness of the village.[37]

Suggestion is clearly distinct from indication. For example, in the example, "the village on the Ganges", should it be objected that indication's power of evoking the clarifying

---

[35]A. B. Gajendragadkar, a modern commentator on aesthetics, lists two conditions other than the apparently contradictory meaning of denotation: (1) there must be a connection (tadyoga) between denotation and indication; (2) the connection must follow established usage or purpose (rūḍhiprayogānānyatarat). Notes on the Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammaṭa. Poona: Aryabhushan Press, 1939, pp. 249-252.

[36]K. Krishnamoorthy, Tr. Dhvanyāloka. Poona: Oriental Book Agency, 1955, p. 9.

[37]K. C. Pandey. Indian Aesthetics. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1959, second edition, p. 267.

idea of the bank is itself suggestion, Ānandavardhana would counter:

> When another sense is conveyed through indication (laksanā) the first sense merges itself with the second and becomes one with it as in the sentence, "The village on the Ganges." But when one sense conveys another through suggestion, the first sense retains its individuality while conveying the other just like a lamp (remains a lamp while illumining a dark area).[38]

Hence, whereas indication's clarifying idea of the bank merges with the idea of the sentence, "the village on the Ganges", the suggestion of the coolness and holiness of the village does not. However the resulting sentence, "the village on the bank of the Ganges" both retains its denotation and also illumines its further sense. This is the suggestion of the coolness and holiness of the village.

There are three further distinctions between indication and suggestion. First, indication requires an apparent contradiction in the different constituents of a sentence, while suggestion does not, but rather presupposes the hearer's ability to understand the implication of the sentence. Second, in indication only the clarifying idea is added to denotation, whereas in suggestion both meanings -- the clarifying and the implied -- may occur concomitantly.[39] Third, even the topics of indication and suggestion differ: indication is invariably connected with ideas; suggestion either with ideas, poetic

---

[38]Krishnamoorthy, op. cit., pp. 104-105, parenthesis added.

[39]Ānandavardhana. Dhvanyāloka III, 33, p. 99 of Krishnamoorthy, op. cit.

embillishments or sentiments.[40] If one should object, as the Naiyāyika might,[41] that suggestion falls under logical connection, Ānandavardhana would probably retort that such a function exhausts itself in explaining the verbal comprehension of the sentence; it does not suggest anything beyond that. It is synthetical, whereas suggestion supercedes synthesis and usually occurs immediately after logical connection is understood.

Suggestion is also clearly different from denotation:

> As the divine sage said this, Pārvatī, gazing down by her father's side, counted the petals of the lotus she held in her hand.[42]

Here we see the simple denotation of Pārvatī's actions as well as the suggestion of modesty in her demeanor. Indication does not obtain because its prerequisite -- an additional idea clarifying the denotation and merging with it -- is lacking. Rather a clear denotation and a suggested meaning over and above that denotation is shown.

Ānandavardhana also allows that the implied aspect of words has an attractive quality, the impression of which is both total and beautiful:

> Just as charm in (women) exceeds the beauty of all the individual parts observed separately and delights the eye of the passionate onlooker in a most unique fashion

---

[40] Ibid.

[41] S. K. De. Studies in the History of Sanskrit Poetics II. London: Luzac, 1925, p. 194.

[42] Krishnamoorthy, op. cit., p. 43, citing Kumārasaṃbhava VI, 84, emended.

> like the veritable nectar of the gods, so also does this implied meaning.[43]

He gives an example of the progressive manifestation of this implied meaning:

> Though by its own power the word-import conveys the sentence-import just as it escapes notice once its purpose is served, so also that Suggested meaning flashes suddenly across the truth-perceiving minds of cultured critics when they are indifferent towards the conventional meaning.[44]

Suggestion is arrived at when the conventional is subordinated to the implied. This is the purport of Ānandavardhana's use of "indifferent." Perhaps we can put this better by saying that sensitive readers have transcended the conventional meaning (denotation). They have understood both denotation and its implication. An example has already been furnished in Pārvatī's counting the petals of her lotus.

Despite this elucidation, Ānandavardhana faced two important challenges: the first from an objector not identified, and the second apparently from a logician. One may grant that a suggested element different from the denoted exists -- so runs the first objection. But this may be subsumed under denotation inasmuch as it is conveyed by the sentence as a whole and the function of the sentence is denotation. Consequently this suggestion is only one sense leading to the understanding of denotation, "just as the apprehension of word-meaning is only a means to the knowledge of sentence-

---

[43] Ibid., p. 4, verse 2, emended.

[44] Ibid., p. 9, vv. 11-12, emphasis added.

purport."[45] Ānandavardhana retorts that the relationship of word-meaning to sentence-meaning differs from that of the suggested sense to the denoted sense. The former is like the relationship of material cause to a pot; the latter, once fully shaped, cannot be recognized separately from the clay from which it has been shaped. Similarly, after the meaning of a sentence has been understood, the meanings of the individual words are not separately recognized. In this case there is a merging of the individual word-meanings to create the sentence-meaning. On the other hand, he remarks, the relationship of suggestion to denotation is like that of a lamp and a pot:

> Just as the light of the lamp will not recede as soon as the perception of the pot is brought home to the observer, so also, the (denoted) sense will continue to shine out even after the apprehension of the suggested sense has been achieved.[46]

Here the suggested sense and the denoted sense are clearly distinct, thus establishing a specific function for suggestion.

The second objection is that suggestion may be implication which arises from the middle term of a syllogism leading to an inference. A Nyāya syllogism is: the mountain (minor term) is fiery (major term) because of smoke (middle term). Consequently, what is suggested (the mountain is fiery) is inferred from the middle term (because of smoke). Also, since Ānandavardhana explains that words possessing suggestion

---

[45] Ibid., p. 101.

[46] Ibid., p. 103, parenthesis added.

refer to the speaker's intention, the speaker's meaning must be inferable. Ānandavardhana rejoins:

> It is only the aspect of intention on the part of the speaker to employ words. . . . that is inferable and not the meaning itself conveyed by his words. If it were true that the meaning itself could form the probandum (conclusion) of an inference having words for its probans (reason), there should be no scope for doubts at all whether any meaning is right or wrong. For instance, when the probandum, fire, is inferred from the probans, smoke, there is indeed no room for any doubt about the existence of fire.[47]

But since smoke may arise from wet fuel, for instance, there is no invariable concomitance (vyāpti) between smoke and fire. Therefore in the sentence, "I saw smoke", doubt may arise as to what meaning smoke indicates. The meaning of the intention comes under denotation, not inference, and may be forther illustrated by suggestion, which is an independent power based on denotation. And whatever arises from denotation is not inference; but suggestion so arises; hence it is not inference. Also, since inference posits the relationship of the minor term to the major term through the middle term, there is mediacy of understanding; suggestion, however, is immediate. It is a sudden response to a whole and not a deliberated analysis.

A threefold distinction exists within suggestion: the suggestion of an idea (vastudhvani), of a poetic embellishment (alaṅkāradhvani), and of a sentiment (rasadhvani). The first and second types of suggestion are self-explanatory and will be illustrated later. The third, relating to the determinants, consequents and transient emotions, is the cause of aesthetic

---

[47] Ibid., p. 113, emphases and parentheses added.

experience itself. It suggests ideas necessary for the intensification of the permanent emotion and effects the universalization of the individual reader.

The possible origin of this theory of suggestion is the pattern (sphoṭa) theory of the grammarians. According to Bhaṛtrhari, a prominent grammarian and philosopher of language, the individual sounds of a word successively pronounced to evoke a whole suggest the word's pattern.[48] A sentence is a single undivided utterance whose meaning is, "an instantaneous flash of insight."[49] Further, the term "pattern" besides indicating particular eternal words also signifies ultimate reality. In Ānandavardhana three parallels -- two clear and one probable -- are postulated. The first is the idea of suggestion which entails a manifestation over and above its constituent parts. The second is the tenet that poetry's meaning is given to a flash of understanding as even the title of Ānandavardhana's chapters -- uddyota, "flashing" -- indicates.[50] The third is Ānandavardhana's reshaping of the grammarians' concept of suggestion, deflecting its primary emphasis on

---

[48]Ibid., p. 110. For further discussion of the Sphoṭa theory see Vākyapadīya with the commentary of Vṛṣabhadeva on the first chapter and that of Punyarāja on the second. Benares, 1887 in K. Kunjunni Raja. Indian Theories of Meaning. Madras: Adyar, 1963, pp. 124-126 and M. M. Sharma. The Dhvani Theory in Sanskrit Poetics. Varenasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1968, p. 35.

[49]K. Kunjunni Raja. Indian Theories of Meaning. Madras: Adyar, 1963, p. 98.

[50]Krishnamoorthy, op. cit., p. 1.

secoessive sounds in a word to his own stress on successive words in a sentence. It is not improbable therefore that he has also used the object of suggestion specified in the grammarians -- ultimate reality. For it is illogical to appropriate to oneself only one half of the coin, the means, without also taking over the other, the end. Consequently implicit in Ānandavardhana's theory of suggestion, the means, is the goal of suggestion, the imaginative realm of idea, of poetic embellishment and of sentiment, which is itself participant in ultimate reality. Suggestion's transcendence is buttressed by Ānandavardhana's conception of the object of poetry. Although this purpose is nowhere stated in his Treatise on the Theory of Suggestion, it is nevertheless implied throughout. For Ānandavardhana poetry is a means to seeing the image of effulgent reality.[51] Suggestion points towards the Real in itself. This means to the transcendent -- suggestion -- must itself participate in the supranormal ambiance of its end. The significance of this theory becomes clear; it establishes the transcendent aspect of poetry, connecting the aesthetic with the spiritual.

Ānandavardhana also explains this transcendence with respect to the three types of suggestion. Because each of these evokes a response in the sensitive reader, a mutual mental experience of both poet and sensitive reader arises. This

---

[51] Ibid., p. x.

imaginative play in which the sensitive reader overcomes his limitation as an individual, and participates in the reality outside himself -- the poem -- is in a sense, estatic. The cultured response on the reader's part transports him out of his temporal cares into a non-temporal experience, in which there is an absorption in the suggested motif. This experience embodies an initial level of transcendence. Let examples convey the flavor of Ānandavardhana's threefold theory:

Suggestion of idea (*Vastudhvani*)

Ramble freely, pious man!
That dog today is killed
By the fierce lion that dwells
In Godā river dells.[52]

The suggested idea here is the opposite of the expressed exhortation. The real intention of the verse is the idea that the man should not be waking in that valley since his life would be jeopardized by the lion present there.

Suggestion of poetic embellishment (*Alaṅkāradhvani*)

Filling all space with light
of beauty
And smiling when your face doth
remain
O sweet-eyed one, since the sea
doesn't swell
I am sure it is only a mass
of water.[53]

The suggested poetic embellishment here is a metaphor linking the smile on the lady's face to the beautiful light of day. It also implies that the sea's lack of response indicates its lifeless character. In short, the lady's smile is described

---

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

as if it were the sun illumining the earth.

Suggestion of sentiment (Rasadhvani)

> The deer flees, casting ever and again his glance
> with graceful curving of his neck at the pursuing chariot,
> his terror of the arrow's flight so great
> his hindpart seems to penetrate his breast.
> He drops upon the way the half-chewed grass
> from his mouth that pants with weariness.
> See, as he leaps he seems to fly
> more in the air than on the ground![54]

The suggested element here is fear. In involving himself imaginatively in each of these examples the sensitive reader exercises his contemplative faculty, through an absorption that affords him entry into the new realm of the non-temporal. This absorption is the crucial reason for asserting that the poetic experience is incipiently transcendental.

Although Ānandavardhana lists the three different aspects of suggestion he implicitly prefers the suggestion of sentiment. In fact, in one verse, situated in the context of the third class of suggestion, he explicitly shows this preference:

> That meaning alone is the soul of poetry; and so it was that of yore the sorrow of the First Poet (i. e. Vālmikī) at the separation of the curlew couple took the form of a distich.[55]

This refers to the first chapter of the Rāmāyaṇa in which Valmiki witnesses the slaughter of a male curlew (krauñca) bird who is having sexual intercourse with his mate. The cries of the dying bird and the wailing of its mate stirred

---

[54]Daniel H. H. Ingalls. An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965, p. 328.

[55]Krishnamoorthy, op. cit., p. 6. (Dhvanyāloka I, 5).

a deep strain of pathos in Vālmikī to the point that his personality was lost in it. It was not an emotion of sympathy that was experienced but a sentiment of sorrow. Whereas an emotion because of its personal involvement may be painful, a sentiment because of its detachment is intrinsically pleasurable. The sentiment of sorrow issued forth in the verse:

> No fame be thine for endless time
> Because, base outcaste, of thy crime
> Whose cruel hand was fain to slay
> One of this gentle pair at play.[56]

The poetic expression of sorrow in this verse convinced Ānandavardhana that the suggestion of sentiment is the soul of poetry, and that

> the main task of a master-poet lies in a proper marshalling of all the contents and the expressions in the direction of sentiments. . . .[57]

And as he remarks in another place:

> This class of poetry — with subordinate suggestion — will also assume the form of Dhvani or that with principal suggestion, if one views it from the standpoint of exclusive purport of sentiments. . . .[58]

and further on:

> Though several varieties of the suggested-suggester relationship is possible, the poet should be most intent upon one of them in particular — that relating to the delimitation of sentiment. . . .[59]

In all these remarks there is a decided preference for the

---

[56] I, 2, 15. Pandit, May 1, 1869, Benares.

[57] Krishnamoorthy, op. cit., p. 97 (Dhvanyāloka III, 32).

[58] Ibid., p. 122 (Dhvanyāloka III, 40).

[59] Ibid., p. 140 (Dhvanyāloka IV, 5).

suggestion of sentiment.

(5) ABHINAVAGUPTA'S RASA-THEORY

Abhinavagupta asserts that rasa may be experienced both in poetry and in drama. The close connection of poetics and drama, assumed by Bharata, was passed over by Ānandavardhana; it was left to Abhinava to examine its implications. By specifically including drama in his discussions of rasa, Abhinava stresses the fact that rasa may be enjoyed in drama too. Nevertheless, in his aesthetic considerations he is indebted both to Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka whose theory of generalization he appropriates and to Ānandavardhana whose theory of suggestion he uses. In his explicit examination of rasa within the drama Abhinava is original, but not in his appropriation of previous theories, and his distinctive contribution lies primarily in the transcendence and subjectivity of the rasa-experience.

For Abhinava the drama is

> a matter that is to be steadily cognized by a profoundly concentrated mind which is undergoing a direct experience (of the incidents portrayed) due to the power of the actor's acting.[60]

The person who views the drama must be refined:

> Those people who are capable of identifying with the subject matter, as the mirrors of their hearts have been polished through constant repetition and study of poetry (or drama), and who sympathetically respond in their hearts -- those (people) are what are known

---

[60] Masson and Patwardhan. Aesthetic Rapture II. 60, note p. 353.

as sensitive readers (or spectators).[61]

It is in this cultured reader or spectator that the generalization of the determinants, consequents and transient emotions occurs. Such a reader contemplates images in poetry or in drama independently of his own life, the character's life or the actor's portrayal. Consequently, these images are de-individualized or generalized. Raniero Gnoli, Abhinavagupta's most skillful translator, states that:

> Generality is . . . a state of self-identification with the imagined situation, devoid of any practical interest and from this point of view, of any relation whatsoever with the limited self, and as it were impersonal. The determinants and consequents differ from ordinary causes and effects just on account of this state of generality.[62]

Thus generalization unmasks the infinitude of the limited Self, because it brings about its transfer from the practical to the idealized realm. The sensitive reader has a direct experience of a sort which is completely different from practical experience. This experience is rasa. Abhinava, commenting on the verse of Kālidāsa quoted above, writes:

> In (the sensitive reader) hearing the phrase . . . "There he (the deer) is now, gracefully by the bending of his neck, casting a glance ever and anon at the chariot which pursues him, by the contraction of the hinder half of his body repeatedly drawing himself into the forepart of his body through fear of the descent of the arrow; strewing the road with grass half-chewed which drops from his mouth kept open from

---

[61]Abhinavagupta. Dhvanyālokalocana 38, cited in Masson and Patwardhan. Sāntarasa and Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Aesthetics. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1969, p. 78, parentheses added.

[62]Gnoli, op. cit., p. xxii.

> exhaustion" . . ., there appears immediately after the perception of the literal sense, a perception of a different order which completely eliminates the temporal distinction assumed by these sentences. . . . what there appears is simply and solely fear -- fear in itself, uncircumscribed by time, space, etc. . . . (It) is the matter of cognition devoid of obstacles, and may be said to enter directly into our hearts, to dance before our eyes; this is the terrible rasa.[63]

Abhinava accentuates here that rasa is a perception, though of a peculiar nature. If it be objected that Bharata's phrase, rasa-niṣpattiḥ, denotes the production of rasa as an object of perception, Abhinava rejoins that the purport of that phrase is the production of the tasting of rasa.[64] Accordingly, rasa is a perception which is also a tasting.

Sentiment also has a supranormal character. What in ordinary life is emotion becomes -- through generalization -- in dramatic performance, sentiment. Therefore the identification of the sensitive reader and the predominant sentiment is not on the level of one's empirical self but of one's transcendental self. This identification involves the transcendent because its corrolary is the idealization of the permanent emotion, which in turn involves its own latent impressions (vāsanās).

According to Abhinava there are two kinds of these latent impressions: innate and acquired. Regarding the former the Abhinava Bhāratī reads:

> Indeed every creature from its birth possesses these nine forms of consciousness. In fact everyone is by

---

[63]Ibid., pp. 54-56.

[64]Ibid., pp. 85-86, citing Abhinava Bharati I, 286.

> nature pervaded by sexual desires (delight); believes himself to be superior to others, whom he is thus led to deride (laughter); grieves when he is forced to part from what he loves (sorrow); gets angry at the causes of such separation (anger); gets frightened when he finds himself powerless (fear); -- but still is desirous of overcoming the danger which threatens him (heroism); has a sense of revulsion directed toward an ugly object (disgust); wonders at the sight of extraordinary deeds done by himself or others (astonishment); and lastly, is desirous of abandoning certain things (serenity). No living creature exists without the latent impressions of these (permanent emotions).[65]

The latter type of latent impressions includes both the knowledge of one's own emotional experiences and the observations of the emotional experiences of others. These three forms -- one innate and two acquired -- constitute the latent impressions of the permanent emotions. When these latent empressions become active through the determinants, consequents and transient emotions, the idealization of the permanent emotions results. Thus it is clear that the generalization of the determinants, consequents and transient emotions and the impersonalization of the permanent emotions are the two necessary components of the resulting experience of rasa.

This experience is not one of ordinary emotion, but of sentiment, which is the peculiar tasting of the transcendental urgrund:

> According to us that which is tasted is consciousness alone which is saturated with beatitude. . . . This consciousness which is single in itself, is nevertheless differentiated by the operation of the latent traces of delight, sorrow, etc., which are awakened by the operation of the Consequents, etc.[66]

---

[65] Ibid., p. 74, citing Abhinava Bhāratī.

[66] Ibid., p. 72, citing Abhinava Bhāratī I, 292.

Consonant with the unity to which Abhinava here refers is the radical wholeness of rasa. This completeness exercises its raw power on the spectator:

> . . . when it (rasa) is relished (says Mammaṭa), it appears as if vibrating before the eyes, entering the inmost recesses of the heart, inspiriting the entire body, and eclipsing everything else.[67]

Since Abhinava in his theological works -- the Tantrasāra for one -- considers that unity and power are properly Śiva's, the unity and power of rasa must also participate in the transcendent.

Abhinava uses five terms which confirm this supranormal dimension of rasa. The first is delight (ānanda). Abhinava explicitly states that poetry's purpose is not only pleasure but delight. Whereas most earlier writers use the term "pleasure" (prīti) or "entertainment" (vinoda) when describing the object of poetry, Abhinava uses the religious term "bliss" or "delight":

> Although knowledge and pleasure (prīti) for the reader are both present, as Bhāmaha has said: "Study of good poetry confers fame and pleasure, as well as skill in dharma, artha, kāma and mokṣa, and skill too in the fine arts", nevertheless, pleasure (prīti) is the main thing. Otherwise how would poetry, a source of knowledge comparable to a (loving) wife, differ from the Vedas, etc., which are also sources of instruction comparable to a master, or from sources of instruction such as the itihāsas, etc., which are comparable to a friend? And so delight (ānanda) has been mentioned (here) primarily (as the purpose of

---

[67]G. Jha, op. cit., p. 58.

poetry). Even of instruction in the four goals of life delight (ānanda) is the final and major result.[68]

Abhinava also hints in this passage that bliss (ānanda) can be realized through suggestion. Whereas scripture is given from superior to inferior, and tradition from equal to equal, poetry and drama are given from lover to beloved. In this intimacy poetry suggests delight to the sensitive reader.

The second term describing the supranormal dimension of rasa is "extraordinary" (alaukika). In a drama the evocation of the latent impressions of the permanent emotions through the determinants, consequents and transient emotions results in "a state of aesthetic relish which is a form of consciousness free from worldly obstacles."[69] This tasting is extraordinary: it is distinguished from all normal means of knowledge:

> Now this suggested sense such as rasādi is not produced the way joy is produced when (a man hears the words) 'A son has been born to you', nor does it come about through lakṣaṇā (indication). No, rather this (suggested sense) arises in the fully responsive reader as being relished by him through his awareness of the vibhāvas and anubhāvas, from the force of his sympathetic response and through his identification . . . . (This) aesthetic enjoyment of rasa consists in a completely extraordinary (alaukika) sense of wonder (camatkāra) and is totally different from ordinary feelings like memory or inference.[70]

For Abhinava, rasa's extraordinariness is proved by two considerations. First, the use of a new vocabulary, for were rasa

---

[68]Masson and Patwardhan, Śāntarasa . . ., pp. 54-55, citing Locana, 40; Sanskrit text in note 4. Pattabhirama Shastri, ed. Haridas Sanskrit Series, #135, Benares, 1940.

[69]Masson and Patwardhan. Aesthetic Rapture I, pp. 26-27, citing Abhinava Bhāratī I, 284.

[70]Ibid., p. 27, citing Locana, 79.

worldly there would be no need for words like vibhāva; the old term karaṇa (cause) would suffice. Instead of saying anubhāva, one could have said kārya (effect) instead. Bharata's coining of new words is thus the first indication that the aesthetic dimension is distinct from the ordinary. Second, rasa's non-susceptibility to the analysis of ordinary causality, for were it otherwise it would have to fulfill causation's two requisites: (a) A cause which produces an effect can be destroyed after the effect's production, although the effect continues to exist.[71] For instance, after the production of a pot, one of the tools used to make it may be destroyed without the pot's being affected. It is otherwise in the case of rasa; its supposed cause comprises the determinants, consequents and transient emotions. Once they are withdrawn, the effect, the relishing of rasa, terminates. (b) A cause which reveals an object uncovers a previously existent one, as a lamp which illumines a table that had been in the dark.[72] This condition again is not complied with in rasa, as the latter does not exist prior to the suggestion of the determinants, consequents and transient emotions. So, when an objector remarks that nothing in the whole world corresponds to what Abhinava states about rasa, the latter replies, "Ah, at last you have understood."[73]

---

[71] A. Sankaran. The Theories of Rasa and Dhvani. Madras, 1929, p. 109.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Masson and Patwardhan. Aesthetic Rapture I, p. 32, citing Locana, 158.

The third term which characterizes rasa's supranormal dimension is camatkāra:

> This (form of) consciousness without obstacles is called camatkara: . . . (it) may be likewise defined as an immersion in an enjoyment which can never satiate and is thus uninterrupted. The word camatkara indeed properly means the action being done by a tasting subject; in other words, by the enjoying subject, he who is immersed in the vibration of a marvellous enjoyment.[74]

I contend that Abhinava's technical understanding of this word is an important constituent of his rasa-theory. It is precisely in this word that the transcendence (alaukikatva) of rasa is accentuated. In Vasugupta's Śivadṛṣṭi 1, 12, there is the expression, vismayo yogabhūmika-- "the yogic stages are astonishment or wonder."[75] This is similar to what Abhinava means by camatkāra -- as we shall have occasion to see in greater detail in chapter IV. Both expressions connote the surprise evoked by the manifestation of a new dimension of reality. Since camatkāra shares the quality of surprise with a meditative experience, it is probable that it also shares that experience's contemplative flavor. This is evident in the Abhinava Bhāratī:

> In the drama the actor becomes the object of the spectator's contemplation in much the same way as (does an idol) in the case of a worshipper who is meditating (on his favorite deity).[76]

Thus, rasa is the result of a contemplative experience --

---

[74] Gnoli, op. cit., p. xxii.

[75] Ibid., pp. 59-60, citing Abhinava Bhāratī.

[76] Ibid., p. xlvi, note 3, citing Abhinava Bhāratī I, 287.

viewing the drama -- as well as being itself contemplatively nuanced (camatkāra).

The fourth term which describes rasa's supranormal dimension is carvaṇa, an interior gustation.[77] This is implicit in the idea of the latent impressions because the resultant idealization of the permanent emotions is also an interior taste. Abhinava explains this in the context of a discussion on the sentiment of tranquillity. Speaking of the sensitive reader's heart, he remarks that the tasting of this sentiment

> . . . makes such a heart . . . the receptacle of an other worldly bliss by inducing a peculiar kind of introspection.[78]

This is the interior relish of the sentiment which is also its direct irruption. A sentiment can not arise in one's consciousness without being simultaneously relished. If it be objected that Abhinava's reference is peculiar to the sentiment of tranquillity, the answer is that this sentiment, as I will show later, is the basis of all the others, which consequently share this same kind of introspection. Again in Abhinava's interpretation of Vālmikī's writing of the first poem, the poet, as we have seen, after first feeling the emotion of sorrow experiences an interior moment of reflection through which he realizes the sentiment of sorrow. Also an independent

---

[77]Ibid., p. 85, citing Abhinava Bhāratī.

[78]Masson and Patwardhan. Śāntarasa . . ., p. 142, citing śāntarasaprakaraṇam of the Abhinava Bhāratī, as emended by V. Raghavan in his The Number of Rasa-s, 1967, p. 104ff., emphasis added.

treatise states:

> At the moment of rasa-enjoyment the vibhāvas, anubhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas help the mind turn back from the outside world.[79]

Consequently the tasting of rasa also demonstrates an interior relish which ratifies its transcendental character. Whereas ordinary activities engage us externally, rasa-realization both engages and delights us internally.

The fifth term describing rasa's supranormal dimension is pratibhā, intuition or visualization. Abhinava views this from the perspectives of the sensitive reader and of the poet or playwright. On the one hand, from the point of view of the reader it is the power to visualize the suggested sentiment. Since the determinants, consequents and transient emotions only suggest an object, there must be a capacity in the sensitive reader to respond to this hinting, and to see what it is the poet intends. Pandey explains:

> The suggested elements . . . are supplied by this power of visualization which partly removes the shifting opaque barrier which divides the unconscious from the conscious, and brings about the union of the suggested elements which comes from the unconscious, with the given and thus completes the image.[80]

Hence pratibhā from the sensitive reader's end is a response which issues in a visualization drawing on the unconscious. On the other hand, from the poet's or playwright's point of view pratibhā is the intuition or inspiration through which he

---

[79] R. K. Sen. Aesthetic Enjoyment., emphasis added.

[80] Indian Aesthetics, p. 163, citing Locana, 29 and Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vivṛti Vimarśinī III, 197.

conveys the beautiful -- in sentiment. Since sentiment is transcendent (alaukika), the poet's inspiration must be so too.

But pratibhā is more than the sensitive reader's power of visualization and the poet's inspiration:

> (it is) in a broader sense, the same consciousness, the same Self . . . . in the poet, it burns with a purified light -- to shine out fully in all its completeness in the intuition of the saints.[81]

Accordingly, pratibhā is a divine impulse manifestative of Śiva; it is the beginning of complete apprehension which is liberation.

Abhinava also enumerates seven obstacles to rasa-realization, which supply a negative approach clarifying whatever lacks in the positive:

(1) the unsuitability of the portrayal -- its lack of similarity to ordinary events and the consequent failure to immerse one's consciousness in it;

(2) the arising of temporal and spatial determinations ascribed to oneself or to another in a personal manner;

(3) the emergence of personal tastes of pleasure and pain;

(4) the physical inability to perceive the drama or poem;

(5) the lack of clarity due to verbal testimonies and inference rather than direct perception of the drama;

(6) the subordination of the principal rasa to the determinants, consequents and transient emotions; if the permanent emotion is not delineated, there can be no contemplation of it and conse-

---

[81]Gnoli, op. cit., p. LI, citing Tantrāloka, XI, pp. 60-62, emended.

quently no evocation of rasa;

(7) the association of doubt unless all the determinants, consequents and permanent emotions are considered together. For instance, tears may arise, from a diseased eye or from joy. But where the death of a close relative is the determinant, crying the consequent emotion, and depression the transient, there is no doubt that the permanent emotion is sorrow.[82]

In sum, this list of obstacles underscores the fact that rasa must arise from the depiction of ordinary emotion, that it is impersonal, that it is perceived and that it centers upon the permanent emotion. All of these posit the immersion of consciousness in rasa.

Rasa-realization is the blissful experience suggested in poetry and drama. Concerning Ānandavardhana's threefold theory of suggestion, Abhinava writes:

> Although the suggested sense in general is the point at issue, only the third (type of the suggested sense) known as rasa-dhvani, should be considered as (the soul of poetry). . . . Therefore really speaking, rasa alone is the soul (of poetry). Vastudhvani and alaṅkāradhvani finally end up in rasa.[83]

Abhinava here intensifies Ānandavardhana's predominant stress on the suggestion of sentiment -- the sole object of poetry which brings bliss. For Ānandavardhana, the suggestion of idea (vastudhvani) and of poetic embellishment (alaṅkāradhvani) are important poetic devices; for Abhinava, since they are

---

[82]Ibid., pp. 62-78, passim.

[83]Masson and Patwardhan Śāntarasa . . ., pp. 81-82, citing Locana, 84.

incapable of bringing delight, they become merely ancillary to the suggestion of sentiment, which can achieve this bliss.

Important to this exaltation of rasadhvani is Abhinava's interpretation of the Vālmīkī episode of the Rāmāyaṇa. There the poet's witnessing of the slaying of the curlew and of its mate's cries issues in a spontaneous outburst in verse-form; sorrow transformed itself into poetry.[84] Abhinava remarks that the verse illustrates not sorrow but the sentiment of sorrow. First Vālmīkī feels real sorrow; then it is as if he were watching a play. The determinants are the forest setting and the act of intercourse; the consequents are the male bird's writhing on the ground and the female's cries. Vālmīkī sympathizes and identifies with the situation through which the sentiment of sorrow is evoked in him. Distant from the real sorrow that he had previously felt, he recites the verse. When therefore he states at Rāmāyaṇa 1, 2. 16,[85] "What is this that I have uttered?" he is then the sensitive reader, for he is contemplating that sentiment embodied in his verse, "No fame be thine for endless time. . . ."

But if the verse arose from the aesthetic enjoyment of the emotion of sorrow, how is it that the soul of poetry is the sentiment and not the emotion of sorrow, since there is no sentiment mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa verse? Abhinava counters:

---

[84] śoka ślokatvamāgataḥ

[85] Pandit, op. cit., p. 267.

> Since the state of mind appropriate to the vibhāvas (determinants) and anubhāvas (consequents) in relation to the stāyibhāva (permanent emotion) śoka (sorrow), when aesthetically enjoyed becomes rasa, it is but proper to say that the sthāyin (permanent emotion) itself attains the status of rasa.[86]

Hence Abhinava by using the technical terms of the rasasūtra shows the artistic distance of Vālmīki from the slaying of the curlew; through this remoteness the sentiment is experienced and transformed into verse.

The suggestion of rasa now becomes the central focus. Subsequently, after arguing that sentiment is perceived, Abhinava writes:

> In bringing about this perception the function is the suggestiveness, i.e., the vyañjanā (suggestion) of the literal sense and denotative words, which is a function different from abhidhā (denotation).[87]

He strongly reiterates this point adding that sentiment's enjoyment is its very reality:

> Rasas are suggested (abhivyajyante). They are aesthetically enjoyed by their very perception.[88]

Abhinava goes on to say:

> . . . it (rasa) has a form which is capable of being relished through the function of personal aesthetic relish, which is bliss (ānanda) that arises in the sahṛdaya's (sensitive reader's) delicate mind that has been colored by the appropriate latent impressions that are deeply embedded from long before; appropriate, that is, to the beautiful vibhāvas and anubhāvas, and

---

[86] Masson and Patwardhan, Śāntarasa . . ., p. 88, citing Locana, 89, parentheses added.

[87] Ibid., p. 75, citing Locana, 186.

[88] Ibid., citing Locana, 51, parenthesis added.

> beautiful again, because of their appeal to the heart. . . .[89]

The latent impressions are beautiful; the perception of sentiment is bliss. This implies that the perception of the beautiful gives rise to the experience of bliss. Whatever vestige of personal emotion inheres in the perception of the beautiful is eliminated and the perception itself is raised to the level of sentiment. Consequently when, through suggestion, one discerns the beautiful at its climax, bliss ensues.

(6) ŚĀNTARASA

Abhinava's understanding of sentiment (rasa) also includes his appraisal of the sentiment of tranquillity (śāntarasa). This is both innovative and profound. As we will see, it lends support to the translation of alaukika as "supranormal" rather than "extraordinary."

We have already seen that for Abhinava the purpose of poetry and drama is delight (ānanda). This is equally the goal of religious life. In the Threefold System Śiva with his śakti personify delight; therefore, man's divine realization, the goal of the religious life, is also delight. Abhinava believes that poetry and drama are expressions of an ineffable transcendent experience. He states that Śiva is the deity of the drama because the dance he performs at sundown is an

---

[89] Ibid., citing Locana, 51, parenthesis added.

ecstatic manifestation, with no purpose except to reveal joy.[90] This spontaneous bliss of Śiva's is portrayed in the dance and also represented in poetry and drama. Tasted by the sensitive reader this joy is the experience of rasa. Thus Abhinava maintains the basic affinity of the religious experience with the aesthetic. To put it precisely, he asserts that the aesthetic experience of tranquillity (śāntarasa) -- rasa in its genuine sense -- may occasion liberation.

In the Abhinava Bhāratī Abhinava states that literature, poetry and drama cannot confine themselves to the first three goals of life but must extend also to the fourth and greatest of life's ends -- liberation. The particular poem or drama must exhibit peace and must evoke tranquillity as its sentiment.[91] When the sentiment of tranquillity is suggested and the sensitive reader responds:

> The purity of our emotion and the intensity of it takes us to a higher level of pleasure than we could know before -- we experience sheer and undifferentiated bliss for we have come into direct contact with the deepest recesses of our own consciousness where the memory of a primeval unity between man and the universe is still strong.[92]

As explained in the preceding chapter, man's liberation is the true understanding of himself as Śiva, who is united with all

---

[90] Masson and Patwardhan. Aesthetic Rapture I, p. 20, citing Abhinava Bhāratī, I, 2.

[91] Abhinava Bhāratī I, 314. Cited in V. Raghavan. The Number of Rasa-s. Madras: Adyar, 1967, p. 30.

[92] Masson and Patwardhan, Śāntarasa . . ., vii-viii.

things. Thus if śāntarasa effects an understanding of man as intimately united with all things, it effects liberation.

But from where does this śāntarasa arise? Bharata only mentions eight rasas in the Treatise on Drama. It is still true, Abhinava points out, that in Bharata's words:

> When a sentence (or poem) has been heard often before, or if it is recited again and again and yet does not bore (the reader), then it is a case of the quality known as 'sweetness.'[93]

Abhinava deduces from this that if we wish to taste the delight of a poem, we must take a long slow walk along the paths of poetry. The repetition of which Bharata speaks suggests a slow poring over a poem or drama and for Abhinava this is a meditative process. Indeed, Bharata even compares the apprehension of the suggestion of sentiment to a yogin's meditative perception.[94] He also remarks:

> those without passion are interested in (spectacles dealing with) mokṣa.[95]

and

> (drama) sometimes shows (mystic) peace.[96]

There are also texts of the Treatise on Drama in which a section on śāntarasa precedes the description of the other

---

[93]Nāṭyaśāstra XVI, 104, cited in Masson and Patwardhan. Aesthetic Rapture II, p. 26, note 169: Gaekward Oriental Series, Baroda, II, 1934. (K. S. Ramaswami Shastri, ed.)

[94]Ibid., p. 27, note 178 (M. Ramakrishna Kavi, ed. Gaekward Oriental Series, Baroda, I, 1956.) Nāṭyaśāstra VII, 30.

[95]Nāṭyaśāstra XXXVII, 58. Masson and Patwardhan. Śāntarasa, p. 137, note 6.

[96]Nāṭyaśāstra I, 109-110. Masson and Patwardhan, ibid., p. 23, note 152: kvaccic chamah.

rasas;

> Now śānta, which has śama for its sthāyibhāva, and which leads to mokṣa, arises from the vibhāvas such as knowledge of the truth, detachment, purity of mind, etc. It should be acted out by means of the anubhāvas, such as . . . concentration of the mind on the Self, devotion, compassion towards all creatures. . . . The emotions arise out of śānta depending on their particular respective causes. And when the specific causes cease to function, they all merge back into śānta.[97]

Abhinava may have seen this version of Bharata's text. This finds corroboration on the Abhinava Bhāratī, 340 and in the Locana, 391, where the last two lines of this version are ascribed to Bharata.[98] Crediting, as Abhinava does, part of the passage to Bharata, it is not unreasonable to assume that he may also have credited the whole of it to the same author. However, it is probably true, as will be shown later, that Abhinava actually thought that the passage was a later interpolation. What therefore prompted his advancing of śāntarasa? Bharata had given some indications of the unity of rasa and its meditative orientation. Nevertheless it was Abhinava who saw clearly that every occasion evokes in man a desire for spiritual peace, and his religious propensity demanded that his rasa theory be truly transcendent.

However, Abhinava could also point to Ānandavardhana as an exponent of śāntarasa:

---

[97] Nāṭyaśāstra, Gaekward Oriental Series ed., I: 332-335, in ibid., pp. 92-93.

[98] Ibid., note 5.

> We state emphatically (says Ānandavardhana) that there is a sentiment of Quietude and its nature is delineationoof the joy due to the weakening of desire. . . . Even granting that this joy is above the experience of all individual men, one will not be justified at all in dissenting to its constituting the unique experience of extraordinary persons.[99]

Can the sentiment of quietude be subsumed under heroic sentiment (vīrarasa)? No, says Ānandavardhana, because the latter displays egoism whereas the former does not. Might compassionate heroism (dharmavīra) be a form of this sentiment? Yes, providing it is understood that if egoism supervenes, it can no longer be a form of the sentiment.[100]

Again, Ānandavardhana refers to the preëminence of quietude in the Mahābhārata:

> In the Mahābhārata too, which combines the elements of instruction and poetry in one, it will be seen that its conclusion in a note of despair consequent to (the) miserable deaths of Vrṣnis as well as Pāṇdavas, as constructed by the great sage, . . . throws light upon the fact that he meant final emancipation as the foremost of human values and Quietude as the most predominant sentiment in the whole work.[101]

But since Vyāsa's introduction to the great epic claims that it illumines all sentiments and yet the sentiment of quietude is not discussed there, Ānandavardhana holds that this sentiment has been rendered through suggestion in the sentence: "Herein, truly, will be glorified Lord Vāsudeva, the Eternal."[102]

---

99 Krishnamoorthy, op. cit., p. 94, emended.

100 Ibid.

101 Ibid., p. 141.

102 Mahābhārata I, i, 256 in ibid., p. 142.

The suggested meaning is that all the topics of the epic -- the tragic exploits of the Pāṇḍavas, for one -- arise from ignorance, thus leading one to seek the highest truth. This is the eternal Lord Vāsudeva who is realized in liberation and suggested in the sentiment of quietude.

Moreover, Ānandavardhana remarks, by appending a description of Kṛṣṇa's genealogy (Harivaṁśa) to the end of the epic, the poet has given this suggested idea more strength. This notion -- to seek liberation -- impels one to be devoted to God and to eschew the world. It fructifies in the adoration of Lord Vāsudeva. Thus what is initially suggested in the introductory sentence -- "Herein truly will be glorified Lord Vāsudeva, the Eternal." -- is symmetrically reiterated in the genealogy of Kṛṣṇa, since its solemnity suggests divine glory.

Thus for Ānandavardhana the Mahābhārata as a scripture evinces liberation; as a poem, the sentiment of tranquillity. These important aspects have been suggested rather than described. In this interpretation Ānandavardhana implements his own Dhvani-theory. It is clear that Ānandavardhana had some thoughts on śāntarasa in poetry; it remained to Abhinavagupta to develop them further, and to eclipse Ānandavardhana's insights with his penetrative originality. I shall now estimate the three reasons which led Abhinavagupta to recognize śāntarasa as the ninth rasa.

First Abhinava knew certain old manuscripts of the Treatise on Drama which enumerated nine rasas. It is not completely clear whether he accepted this reading as the

genuine one. There are conflicting illustrations in Abhinava's works. In one place he asserts that "nine" is the correct reading, stating that those who deny the sentiment of quietude read "eight."[103] In another place he cites the text with only eight rasas. Again, he speaks of those who "read śānta" implying thereby that this reading is not original.[104] Since the chapter on the sentiment of tranquillity in the Abhinava Bhāratī discusses the topic "according to those who read nine rasas",[105] it is very probable that Abhinava recognized "eight" as the correct reading. It is significant, consequently, that notwithstanding some incipient traces of śāntarasa in Bharata, this theory is preponderantly Abhinava's. The first reason therefore for Abhinava's acknowledgement of śāntarasa is that his religious proclivity desired its existence.

Second detachment can be seen in daily life. As the Dhvanyālokalocana reads:

> The complete extinction of desires, that is, love for sense-objects, in the form of the withdrawal (of the mind from every object of the sense, also called) detachment, that alone is happiness. The developing of this, which arises from the aesthetic enjoyment of this detachment, when it turns into an abiding mental state, constitutes the definition of śāntarasa.[106]

---

[103] Masson and Patwardhan, Aesthetic Rapture II, p. 60, note 354.

[104] Masson and Patwardhan, Śāntarasa and Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Aesthetics , p. 35.

[105] Ibid.

[106] Ibid., p. 120. Text of emended edition of Raghavan's The Number of Rasa-s. Madras: Adyar, 1967.

Abhinava remarks that this sentiment can be understood through the analogy of someone's being sated after a large meal.[107] Just as then food loses its attraction, so also worldly pleasures become insipid after we have had our fill of them. Hence, the ordinary man has at least a basis for understanding detachment. He remarks further that the apprehension of <u>śāntarasa</u> must be allowed because yogic stages are similarly perceived. Consequently this sentiment's permanent emotion is detachment which the yogin exhibits; its determinants -- acquaintance with passionless people and with spiritual teaching -- must be presumed, as also must be its transient emotions. Since <u>śāntarasa</u> is an interior experience, the consequents too must be presupposed.[108]

The third reason is Ānandavardhana's assessment of the <u>Mahābhārata</u> with which Abhinava (in the <u>Locana</u>) is in agreement. Although the first three goals of life can be found in other contexts, the fact that they ultimately end in pathos is peculiar to Vyāsa's epic[109]-- which consequently makes obvious the importance of liberation. This is particularly suggested through the sentiment of tranquillity when the work is poetically understood.

---

107 <u>Ibid</u>., p. 98.

108 <u>Ibid</u>.

109 <u>Ibid</u>., p. 100.

(7) THE ABHINAVA BHĀRATĪ'S DISCUSSION OF ŚĀNTARASA

It is however in the chapter on the sentiment of tranquillity (śāntarasaprakaraṇam) of the Abhinava Bhāratī that Abhinava incisively discusses śāntarasa. Presuming the reading of this ninth rasa to be correct he gives a systematic estimation of the five possibilities proposed as its permanent emotion. The first theory is that peace (śama) has ascetic practices and Vedic recitations as its determinants, that it is representable on the stage by the consequent of the absence of lust and that it has firmness as its transient emotion. It is objected that whereas the determinants of the seasons and flowers immediately give rise to love, the determinants of ascetic practices and Vedic recitations do not immediately occasion śāntarasa. If the peace advocate rejoins that the determinants -- ascetic practices and Vedic recitations -- immediately effect the knowledge of truth, the answer is that since knowledge of the truth precedes śāntarasa, these determinants which precede knowledge of the truth are once removed from śāntarasa and do not therefore *immediately* occasion it. Since the determinants by definition must be immediate, the mediacy to śāntarasa of the supposed determinants -- ascetic practices and Vedic recitations -- fails to meet the definitional requisite. Moreover, it is not possible to display absence of lust on the stage. Finally, firmness of mind is attended by a desire for acquisition of objects, a desire

incompatible with *śānta*.[110] Abhinava evidently accepts this refutation for he nowhere alludes to peace again as *śāntarasa*'s permanent emotion.

The second candidate for this permanent emotion is disgust for the world (*nirveda*) that arises from knowledge of the truth. This theory maintains that Bharata strongly believed that a new topic should be begun with an auspicious (*maṅgala*) word. But *nirveda*, with which he begins the *Treatise on Drama* section on transient emotions is not an auspicious word. So he must have had another intention, unless he erred -- which he could not easily have done, since he was a sage. So his purpose must have been to show that disgust for the world (*nirveda*) is both a permanent and transient emotion. Because Bharata situates *nirveda* at the end of the permanent emotions and at the beginning of the transient emotions, it is the hidden permanent emotion corresponding to the covert sentiment of quietude; consequently *nirveda* is *śāntarasa*'s permanent emotion.

However, if such a disgust is proffered as *śāntarasa*'s permanent emotion, what becomes of detachment and meditation which are supposed to be that disgust's very determinants?[111] Knowledge of the truth is its determinant (*vibhāva*). But then detachment and meditation are also advanced as its determinants. So detachment and meditation supposedly cause knowledge of the truth which itself supposedly causes disgust for the world.

---

110 *Ibid.*, p. 106.

111 *Ibid.*, pp. 120-121.

Consequently, detachment and meditation -- once removed from disgust for the world -- are mediate. Since, as previously indicated, determinants must enjoy immediate causality, detachment and meditation are not nirveda's determinants. Again, it is more sensible to posit that disgust for the world leads to knowledge of the truth rather than knowledge of the truth tends toward that disgust, because the latter emotion connotes behavior conducive to spiritual realization. Even in that case, however, nirveda would be the immediate cause of śāntarasa's permanent emotion (knowledge of the truth), but not of śāntarasa.

If it is said that right perception is a determinant of disgust for the world, the objector responds that right perception refers only to a worldly detachment as in sadness, which is itself believed to be a mode of detachment.[112] The proponent also invokes the authority of Gautama, the author of the Nyāyasūtra, who holds that false knowledge leads to true knowledge, itself leading to disgust for the world -- which in turn tends toward liberation. Since worldly disgust and śāntarasa's permanent emotion are both conducive to liberation, they are identical.[113] But even granting that, Abhinava retorts, disgust for the world is placed in the sūtra not as the direct cause of liberation, but as a remote cause. Since śāntarasa must have a direct nexus to liberation, a remote cause -- lacking the necessary immediacy -- does not qualify as its permanent

---

[112]Ibid., p. 124.

[113]Ibid., p. 126, citing Nāṭyaśāstra VII, 28.

emotion.

A third possibility is love (rati), having for its object one's own transcendent and blissful Self; when it depends on study of the scriptures, it becomes śāntarasa's permanent emotion. For support, the proponents cite the Bhagavadgītā III, 17, to the effect that for the man whose love is centered in the Self nothing remains to be accomplished -- he is liberated.[114] Here the ordinary understanding of love is interpreted spiritually. However, the corrolary of love is the erotic sentiment (śṛṅgārarasa) which indicates that this position either construes the Treatise on Drama incorrectly or consciously misrepresents it.

The fourth possibility is multiple. Any of the eight permanent emotions from love to wonder may be the permanent emotion of śāntarasa. This presumes the belief that Bharata admits such a power for each permanent emotion when it is elevated to the level of a sentiment through the determinants, consequents and transient emotions. In this chapter of the Abhinava Bhāratī, however, Abhinava does not indicate where Bharata addresses himself to this point. Hence the basis of this position is not even referred to, making it completely suspect. Notwithstanding this difficulty, Abhinava gives two objections to this theory that any of the permanent emotions may become śāntarasa's permanent emotion. First, that the theory's indefiniteness is its weakness. For if one of the

---

[114] Ibid., p. 127.

permanent emotions may become _śāntarasa_'s permanent emotion, another of them may do so too -- without there being a specific requirement for attaining this status. Hence the permanent emotion of love or of disgust may indifferently occasion _śānta-rasa_. But contradictory emotions can not give rise to the same effect. The second objection is that if there are eight permanent emotions eligible to become _śāntarasa_'s permanent emotion, then there would be at least eight _śāntarasas_. If it be said that only one _śāntarasa_ would obtain because it has only one result, Abhinava replies that:

> then even _vīra_ (heroic) and _raudra_ (furious) would have to be regarded as one _rasa_ because both lead to one single result, namely destruction (of one's enemy).[115]

However, according to Bharata, the heroic and furious sentiments are distinct. If the proponent starts his argument accepting Bharata's authority (in the statement that any of the permanent emotions can become _śāntarasa_'s permanent emotion) he can not support it by denying that same authority (in the implication that the heroic and furious sentiments are the same).

A fifth possibility is that all the permanent emotions conjointly become _śāntarasa_'s permanent emotion. But, as Abhinava deftly notes, different states of mind can not simultaneously obtain.[116] The mutual antagonism of some permanent

---

[115] _Ibid._, p. 129.

[116] _Ibid._, p. 130.

emotions -- of amusement (hāsa) and sorrow (śoka), for instance -- militates against such a coalescing.

Abhinava's own position is that

> knowledge of the truth alone is the means of attaining moksa and so it would be proper to regard that alone as the sthāyibhāva of moksa. Knowledge of the truth is just another name for knowledge of the Self. . . . Therefore, the Ātman alone possessed of such pure qualities as knowledge, bliss, etc., and devoid of the enjoyment of imagined sense objects, is the sthāyibhāva of śānta.[117]

Explicit in this passage is the pervading religious tenor of Abhinava's aesthetic thought, for he posits the transcendental Self as the ground of the sentiment of tranquillity. He asserts, moreover, that śāntarasa's permanent emotion is unique. It is like the canvas of a painter, as contrasted with the other permanent emotions, which are only individual paints affixed to the canvas temporarily. Whereas the paints are alternatively applied, the canvas remains unchanged.[118] Knowledge of the truth is thus the eternal basis of the emotions. By implication śāntarasa, the fruition of knowledge of the truth, must also have an eternal impulse. Hence as the eight permanent emotions are transitory, so are their sentiments; as the ninth permanent emotion is eternal, so is its sentiment -- śānta.

Further, Abhinava defends the omission of knowledge of the truth as śāntarasa's permanent emotion in both texts of the Treatise on Drama. He asserts that since it is the basis

---

[117] Ibid.

[118] Ibid., pp. 130-131.

of all the other permanent emotions it is implicit in them:

> (Just as) between a lame bull and a dehorned bull, bullness (which is the generic property present in both of the bulls) is not considered as a third thing. . . .[119]

so also, he implies, knowledge of the truth, the generic referent of the eight permanent emotions, may not be understood as a separate emotion. On the other hand the moot section of the Treatise on Drama designates peace (śama) as the nature of the Self. Abhinava equates the nature of Self with knowledge of the truth.[120] Consequently, knowledge of the truth is peace which is also a separate permanent emotion. This can be distinctly enjoyed as the sentiment of tranquillity. The eight permanent emotions can be relished as subsidiary moments of śāntarasa which pervades all the sentiments as their basis and yet is itself their zenith. Abhinava also insists on śāntarasa's primacy for he observes that in the text of the Treatise on Drama having nine rasas, śānta is the first sentiment listed. He concretely shows, in addition, the adequation of śāntarasa to the technical terms of the rasasūtra: its determinants are renunciation and fear of saṁsāra, its consequents are ruminations over texts on liberation, and its transient emotions are complete detachment and peace of mind.[121] However, Abhinava could not adduce any drama in which these

---

[119] Ibid.

[120] Ibid., p. 132.

[121] Ibid., p. 139.

aesthetic modes were exemplified. Even in his passage on the Buddhist play Nāgānanda (Joy of Serpents) he remarks that although śāntarasa is established there, it is not the major sentiment.[122] Accordingly he did not give evidence of how śāntarasa is technically suggested in a particular drama, although he insisted that it is capable of dramatic suggestion. The want of śānta plays was sought to be remedied during and after Abhinava's time by writers like Kṛṣṇamiśra (Prabodhacandrodaya) and the Viśiṣṭādvaita theologian and poet, Veṅkaṭanātha (Saṅkalpasūryodaya).

The argument for Abhinava's śāntarasa theory remains strong. He integrates śāntarasa with his general theory of rasa. He demonstrates that the transcendent referent of aesthetic experience is the ātman:

> Śāntarasa is like a very white thread that shines through the interstices of sparsely threaded jewels. It assumes the forms of all the various feelings like love, etc. (which are superimposed on it), because all these feelings are capable of imparting their tinges to it. Even then it shines out (through them), according to the maxim that once the Ātman shines (it shines forever). . . . It is identical with the consciousness of the realization of the highest bliss.[123]

Therefore śāntarasa is the transcendent and blissful ground of the emotions, which is Śiva himself.

For Abhinava śāntarasa also exemplifies the unity of rasa. What makes śāntarasa the essence of rasa? It is the

---

[122] Ibid., p. 135.

[123] Ibid., p. 142, emphasis added.

one fundamental rasa of which the other eight are modifications and is man's spiritual essence in its aesthetic hypostasis.

Hence as Śiva is one, it must also be one and include the eight rasas within it:

> . . . the realization of all rasas, being free from sensual enjoyments, is essentially of the nature of śānta; and when this śānta is conditioned by certain other impressions or emotional moods, it appears in the forms of other rasas and it is to bring out this aspect — viz., that it is the source of all the other rasas -- that it is mentioned by Bharata at the head of all the rasas.[124]

Finally, there is the completely other-worldly sense of this sentiment. Should the śāntarasa experience occur during a drama, it must effect a profound change in one's life:

> It is not like the other rasas, which simply enrich us, provide great scope for our imagination, refine our sensibilities. . . . It means a complete reversal of our personality. . . .[125]

Consequently, it is religious and salvific, the apex of Abhinava's rasa-theory, the deepest plummeting of the aesthetic a priori, where man confronts the stillness of God.

---

[124] A. Sankaran, op. cit., p. 116. Sankaran refers to the "nine rasa" reading of the Nāṭyaśāstra aforementioned.

[125] Masson and Patwardhan. Śāntarasa . . ., p. 123, note 1.

CHAPTER IV

THE SPECIFIC RELATION OF *RASA* TO *ŚAKTI*

Of the two transcendental experiences, one contemplative (*śakti*) and the other aesthetic (*rasa*), we have seen how Abhinava understands the former as the experience of liberation and the latter as one of bliss. Abhinava's thought with regard to these experiences is aptly expressed in at least three terms: surprise (*camatkāra*), imagination (*pratibhā*) and repose (*viśrānti*). Let us begin with *camatkāra* where the contemplative aspect predominates.

(1) COMMON GROUND OF THE TWO EXPERIENCES

Vasugupta writes, *vismayo yogabhūmikā*, "the yogic stages are astonishment."[1] This phrase comprises two aspects, the contemplative and the surprising. There is no doubt that Vasugupta, as the founder of the Threefold School, exercised considerable influence on Abhinava's thought. Hence two probabilities follow: (1) Abhinava's term *camatkāra* carries the same contemplative connotation as Vasugupta's; (2) Abhinava's correlative term *pratyabhijñā* (recognition) embodies the identical facet of amazement as Vasugupta's *camatkāra*. This

---

[1] R. Gnoli, *op. cit.*, XLVI

collateral term pratyabhijñā itself refers to the contemplative aura of camatkāra, for, in the Threefold System, recognition means becoming aware of one's divine nature; a consciousness which is achieved through the four means to liberation -- Means-Without-Means, Śiva-Means, Divine Power-Means and Ceremonial-Means -- three of which are contemplative. Let us examine camatkāra's contemplative aspect in greater detail, and its identity with vimarśa (consciousness), śakti and rasa (sentiment).

Both Utpala and Abhinava suggest this aspect in their commentaries on Utpala's own Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Sūtras. In the context of the two poles of Śiva's nature -- luminosity (prakāśa) and consciousness (vimarśa) -- Utpala equates camatkṛti (self-wonderment), a derived form of camatkāra, with vimarśa.[2] For Abhinava camatkāra is

> . . . nothing but perfect self-consciousness, i.e., consciousness of the Self free from all limitations; it is nothing but Vimarśa in its universal implication, which is the most essential aspect of Prakāśa. . . . As such it is called Ānanda.[3]

But, as I have previously shown, this divine consciousness may be experienced through the contemplative discipline of the Divine Power-Means. Accordingly, camatkāra is subsumed under this particular contemplative path. Abhinava stresses that

---

[2]K. C. Pandey, Indian Aesthetics, 106, citing Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Kārikās 1, 5, 11.

[3]Ibid., pp. 106-107. Pandey's summary, not Abhinava's own words; emphasis added.

the contemplative aspect of camatkāra is blissful and eternal when he writes that it is, "a seizure by joy, unbroken and continuous satisfaction."[4] Pandey remarks that this contemplative experience of camatkāra is a realization without impediment.[5] Therefore, although there is no elaboration of this contemplative aspect in Abhinava's works, there is evidence in his commentary on Utpala's text that he does equate camatkāra with vimarśa. But, as I have shown, the realization of divine consciousness (vimarśa) is also called śakti, Consequently camatkāra and śakti are identical.

Abhinava holds that camatkāra also identifies aesthetically. In the Abhinava Bhāratī he writes to the effect that rasa is camatkāra:

> . . . camatkāra may be likewise defined as an immersion in an enjoyment which can never satiate and is thus uninterrupted. The word camatkāra, indeed, properly means the action being done by a tasting subject . . . by the enjoying subject, he who is immersed in the vibration of a marvellous enjoyment.[6]

In the same work he explicitly states that camatkāra is tantamount to rasa:

> . . . the tasting of Rasa (which consists in a camatkāra different from any other kind of ordinary cognition) differs from both memory, inference, and any form of ordinary self-consciousness.[7]

---

[4]Abhinava Bhāratī I, 279, in Masson and Patwardhan, Śāntarasa, p. 46.

[5]Pandey, Indian Aesthetics, p. 108.

[6]In R. Gnoli, op. cit., pp. 61-62.

[7]In ibid., p. 81.

In the context of rasa-enjoyment in the Dhvanyālokalocana (Investigation into the Treatise on Suggestion), he reaffirms this point:

> The enjoyment, indeed, is identical with the camatkāra, arising from the Rasa-experience itself.[8]

Abhinava explains that this relishing of rasa -- camatkāra -- is the very rasa-experience:

> rasa is the process of perception itself.[9]

Now, we have already seen that śakti and camatkāra are the same. But camatkāra identifies with rasa. Therefore śakti and rasa are one.

Abhinava's second term is pratibhā, poetic imagination which identifies with sadvidyā, śakti and vimarśa; it indicates generally the coalescing of the contemplative and aesthetic experiences, and specifically, its own affinity for the former perception. Generally, in the contemplative ascesis pratibhā designates the mystical stage of Pure Wisdom (sadvidyātattva) which is the initial transition to the divine life; in the aesthetic experience it defines both poetic imagination and a divine impulse manifestative of Śiva. Accordingly, pratibhā identifies the contemplative with the aesthetic. Specifically, Abhinava twice suggests that pratibhā is very close to śakti, if not śakti itself; (a) pratibhā is identical with consciousness

---

[8]In ibid., citing Locana II, p. 4.

[9]pratīyamāna eva hi rasaḥ, Locana, as cited in Masson and Patwardhan, Śāntarasa, 73.

as creative emission;[10] a description equal to the divine self-consciousness (vimarśa) which is, as I have shown, śakti;

(b) pratibhā is the highest knowledge which

> . . . is granted by the 'deities' (śaktis) of Bhairava who reside in the heart and whose vibrating and very subtle activity consists in causing the interior essence to expand,[11]

a remark reminiscent of the Divine Power-Means to liberation. If we recall that pratibhā, as I have shown in chapter two, identifies with śakti, then these statements of Abhinava's may be regarded as corroborative of that fact.

The last of these concepts is absorption or rest in an object (viśrānti), a term first used by Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and later often by Abhinava. In the latter's commentary on Somānanda's Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Śāstra, he describes the pleasure which rasa affords; lacking the practical obstacles of ordinary experience, this enjoyment is peculiar. Abhinava designates it both as "tasting" (rasanā) and as "rest in the Self" (pramātṛtāviśrānti).[12] Thus viśrānti is an aspect of rasa indicating repose. Raniero Gnoli similarly defines this term as

> the fact of our being absorbed in something, to the exclusion of every other thing, without . . . having any mental movement, any extraneous desire . . . which comes to break into that state of consciousness.[13]

This sense of rest, of having reached the goal, is also present

---

[10] Tantrāloka 5, 432 in Gonda, The Vision of the Vedic Poets, The Hague: Mouton, 1963, p. 329.

[11] Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vimarśinī 19, 10 in ibid., p. 343.

[12] II, 178 in Masson and Patwardhan, Śāntarasa, 44.

[13] op. cit., xxiii.

in mystical experience. It is implicit in the Śaiva concept of liberation which denotes plenary consciousness. And what can one long for when one has acquired this plenitude? Since, as I have shown, consciousness in its initial totality is vimarśa, viśrānti, if identified with vimarśa or śakti, is explicit in liberation. As Professor Gnoli points out, viśrānti is so identified; it is

> the repose of everything that exists in the 'I' and . . . the repose of the limited 'I' in . . . consciousness in its original fullness.[14]

This recognition of the finite self as the infinite is precisely śakti's function. Śakti, just as viśrānti, causes rest in the plenitude of consciousness. Therefore viśrānti is a bridge between the aesthetic and the mystical. All these terms acquire their full significance in the context of the aesthetic experience in itself, to which I now turn.

(2) THE AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE PROPER

Although Abhinava treats of the four means to liberation and liberation's bliss in the fourth chapter of the Tantrasāra, he does not describe the mystical experience at great length. But he does explain the aesthetic in some detail and uses it as the criterion by which to assess the mystical experience.

It appears that this aesthetic experience has two blissful levels: the lower, dependent on the latent impressions of previous objective experiences; and the higher where the

---

[14] Ibid.

subject and object merge. The first stage Abhinava often designates "beautiful" (cārutvapratīti), a term which he does not apply to the second. Thus it seems that the lower level of aesthetic experience is both beautiful and blissful whereas the higher is blissful only. Abhinava's predominant use of "beautiful" for the aesthetic experience is not as telling as his use of "blissful" for the same experience. For the graded structure of rasa implies that the bliss experienced on the first level is only preparatory to the fullness of delight which is attained on the second. The bliss proper to the lower stage because it is dependent on the latent impressions is therefore not fully transcendent, although it may intimate transcendence.

In the Abhinava Bhāratī, writing of sensitive readers, Abhinava remarks

> With a . . . completely concentrated mind, they enjoy literature because they are completely absorbed in the thrill of imaginative delight (rasa) that is devoid of any thought of 'I' or 'You.' This imaginative delight is really not different from the inner experience of one's own consciousness which is extremely beautiful because it is pervaded by a great variety of latent impressions of previously experienced happiness, sorrow, etc. This imaginative delight is very different from ordinary perception in which there is always present the disadvantage of hoping to attain the object (of one's pleasure). It is also different from the perception of the yogins which is after all rather dreary (parusa) considering the fact that there is no pleasure in objects.[15]

Here it seems that Abhinava rather sharply distinguishes aesthetic from mystical experience, on the basis of the presence

---

[15]Masson and Patwardhan, Aesthetic Rapture II, pp. 69-70.

or absence of acquired latent impressions (vāsanās). Aesthetic perception is beautiful because one idealizes acquired latent impressions of sentiments like the erotic and the comic. But the yogic or mystical is not because there is no pleasure in objects previously experienced. Rather the subject merges into the object of his contemplation in such a manner that although Śiva becomes an object, he still remains a subject. It this is what Abhinava means, he thus stipulates that the idealization of acquired latent impressions of empirical experiences is necessary to perceive the beautiful. Since yogic experience at best idealizes the innate latent impressions of the sentiment of quietude, it does not meet the stipulation, and accordingly is not beautiful. In other words, the beauty of aesthetic perception consists in the evocation of the latent impressions of earlier experiences by the determinants, consequents and transient emotions, a process foreign to yogic experience. However, Abhinava's remark that yogic experience is "dreary" or "severe" resulting from its inability to enjoy objects is puzzling. It is possible that he means, as Masson and Patwardhan believe, that mystical experience is difficult to realize.[16]

In the Locana also Abhinava, emphasizing the necessity of latent impressions for the emergence of sentiment, implies that mystical experience -- lacking these impressions -- is not beautiful:

> The tasting (of rasa) is pleasant in that the consciousness is colored by the latent traces of the mental

---

[16] Ibid., II, p. 70.

> states of delight, etc., pre-existing (in the minds of the spectators).[17]

Abhinava reserves the expression "beautiful" to the aesthetic proper. Hence, applying the criterion of his use of this designation -- itself inseparably linked with the existence of acquired latent impressions -- it seems that mystical experience is distinct from the aesthetic.

However, the disjunction of the two perceptions is weakened by Abhinava's use of the word ānanda (bliss) to describe both of them. For instance, the Abhinava Bhāratī, describing sentiment, avers that whatever "is tasted is consciousness alone which is saturated with beatitude."[18] We have seen that Abhinave holds the realization of bliss (ānanda) in sentiment as the primary purpose of poetry and drama.[19] But mystical experience is similarly blissful. This point was previously implied in our first chapter where it was affirmed that the self-conscious creative principle (śaktitattva) stands in such a relation to the self-luminous principle (Śivatattva) that bliss obtains. I also remarked there that the second mode of Śiva's immanent aspect is absolute joy, satisfied in itself, independent and at rest -- ānanda. Now, Pandey characterizing mystical experience, which unites with this divine creative

---

[17] Abhinavagupta, Dhvanyālokalocana, 51 in R. Gnoli, op. cit., p. 84.

[18] Abhinava Bhāratī I, 292 -- asmanmante tu samvedanam evānandaghanam āsvādyate. -- in Gnoli, ibid., p. 72.

[19] Locana, 40, in Masson and Patwardhan, Śantarasa, 54.

principle, states that

> the experience of bliss . . . is nothing but the experience of identity, with the Supreme Principle of Consciousness, the Śiva, in indissoluble union with the luminous principle.[20]

Mystical experience is therefore undoubtedly blissful. Since aesthetic perception is both beautiful and blissful whereas yogic is only blissful, it is probable that the former passes into the latter.

(3) THE HIGHER LEVELS OF CONSCIOUSNESS ACCORDING TO ABHINAVA

It is important to understand the different levels of consciousness traditional to Hindu theology in order to situate within them these two levels of aesthetic experience. Abhinava holds the time-honored view that five such levels exist: wakeful (jāgrat), dream (svapna), deep sleep (suṣupti), transcendental (turīya) and pure (turīyātīta).[21] It is the last three which are relevant to this discussion. Deep sleep is comparable with transcendental consciousness in three respects. First, in deep sleep the personality is constituted by the self-luminous aspect of Śiva, but the self-conscious aspect (śakti) is veiled by the power of obscuration (māyā).[22] On the other hand in transcendental experience the Self, cognizant of this self-

---

[20] K. C. Pandey, Abhinavagupta, p. 688, summarizing Parātriṃśika Vivaraṇa, 34.

[21] K. C. Pandey, Indian Aesthetics, p. 124.

[22] Ibid., p. 132.

conscious aspect, shines in its own light. Second, in deep sleep a predominance of objectivity subordinates subjectivity, while in transcendental experience subjectivity's expansion subjects objectivity.[23] Third, in deep sleep the impurity of limitation (āṇavamala) persists -- but in transcendental experience it does not.

More important is pure or mystical experience (turīyātīta) in which the subjectivity not only expands above the objectivity but where the former also greatly eclipses the latter. In pure experience there are two gradations: in the one objectivity continues in the subconscious (vyatireka), and in the other it completely disappears (avyatireka).[24] In the first the Self is affected by the permanent emotion through its acquired latent impressions, but not in the second. It is probable that the two aforementioned levels of aesthetic experience correspond to these two levels of pure experience: (a) aesthetic perception based on acquired latent impressions (rasa) to pure experience in which objectivity persists in the subconscious (vyatireka turīyātīta); (b) aesthetic experience independent of these impressions (śāntarasa) to pure experience in which no objectivity persists (avyatireka turīyātīta). This is the first explanation of aesthetic perception's identity with mystical experience.

---

[23] Ibid., p. 133, citing Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vivṛti Vimarśinī III, 327-8.

[24] Ibid., p. 134.

The second explanation of aesthetic experience's equation with pure experience is found in Pandey who explains that Abhinava's rasa-understanding is characterized both by the complete elimination of objective consciousness and the preponderance of vimarśa (śakti). The latter is the continuous realization of universalized consciousness or the tasting of bliss.[25] But vimarśa itself involves prakāśa (Śiva). Therefore prakāśa also describes aesthetic experience. The implication is clear: aesthetic experience is the realization of Śiva through śakti with which it identifies. It may be objected that Pandey does not give Abhinava's own words concerning this identification, but as his treatment of Abhinava is otherwise continuously faithful to the texts there is no reason to assume untrustworthiness in this instance.

While Pandey's presentation of Abhinava's rasa-understanding is both truthful and acute, he does nevertheless neglect to elaborate on the two levels of aesthetic experience. Perhaps a clearer apprehension of these levels may be arrived at if we understand the lower (involving latent impressions and objectivity) as rasa and the higher (sublating both) as śāntarasa. Does not the persistence of objectivity in the subconscious, characteristic of the lower level, itself point to the transcendent? Yes, but it is only with the complete sublation of objectivity that a truly transcendental experience arises. This profound perception of śāntarasa, effecting

---

[25] Ibid., p. 103.

release, allows a return to the world in the new understanding that the Self and the world are one. But the world does not persist in the subconscious, for the subconscious, like the conscious, is transformed by the *śāntarasa* experience. The perception of the world must be completely reinterpreted in the light of the new experience. If one asserts that the re-interpreted objectivity persists in the subconscious, it may be said in reply that in the *śāntarasa* experience objectivity is completely sublated. In other words, although logically *rasa* may be subsumed under the first level of aesthetic experience, its deepest sense as evident in *śāntarasa* demands its identification with the second level.

The third way of explaining the purity of aesthetic experience is through the twofold cognitive activity which the Trika System postulates. The first kind of knowledge perceives discrete phenomena and also experiences aesthetically; it is detached from practical experience. The second kind organizes data in line with a useful orientation; it is involved with mundane action. In the former cognitive type the limited self sees the empirical object, reacts to it, and formulates an expression of it;[26] for instance, that this lamp is orange. In the latter, the individual systematizes disparate facts purposefully;[27] for example, that these men are friends.

---

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 145.

[27] *Ibid.*, citing *Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vimarśinī* II, 72-3.

Hence, if one is free of the second cognition's practical attitude, one perceives from the first cognition's appreciative perspective. For Abhinava, we recall, sentiment is knowledge, though of a peculiar kind. May he not have had in mind this detached cognitive activity? Assuming that he did, aesthetic perception in the Trika epistemology corresponds to the previously indicated first level of rasa in Abhinava's aesthetics -- the subjective relishing of what one objectively appreciates in a poem or drama. This first level of rasa is itself the lower level of mystical experience (vyatireka turīyatīta).

The mystical dimension of rasa's higher level (śānta-rasa) as well as its identification with śakti's transcendence, is understandable through the claim that it is knowledge. A. Sankaran suggests that if rasa is knowledge, it must be either non-distinct (nirvikalpa) or distinct (savikalpa),[28] that is, either transcendent or empirical, for these categories of knowledge denote unity and diversity respectively. But Jagannātha points out that rasa is both transcendental and empirical cognition:

> From its aspect as intelligence (cid) are established the qualities of eternity and self-luminousness; from its aspect of the permanent emotion, such as love (rati), those of non-eternity and illumination from another source.[29]

---

[28] Op. cit., pp. 109-110.

[29] Jagannātha Panditarāja: edited with the commentary of Nāgeśa Bhatta by Pandit Durgaprasad and K. P. Parab, Kāvyamaka 12, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1939, p. 23.

The first manner of tasting the divine (parabrahmāsvada) is unitive whereas the second is not. For Abhinava, śāntarasa is enjoyed as both kind of gustations: the former when it is the ninth sentiment and the latter when it is the substrate of the other eight sentiments.

Similarly, as the knowledge of rasa is both transcendental and empirical, so śakti is twofold: it is supranormal as Śiva's self-consciousnees and empirical as it leads man to recognition in the vision of Śiva's self-luminosity. Therefore rasa and śakti are equivalent. Nevertheless, this relation raises certain problems which makes it pertinent to peruse their similarities and differences.

(4) SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

Masson and Patwardhan list several of each, in which the former far outweigh the latter. The major similarities are:

1. Both experiences are sheer, undifferentiated bliss (ānandaikaghana).

2. In both experiences, the distance between the subject and object is eliminated.

3. In both experiences, special preparation is necessary: the determinants, consequents and transient emotions in a poem or drama; the mental discipline of impressing upon oneself the truth of the absolute unity of the self in the contemplative discipline.

4. In both cases, what flashes into consciousness is not something new in the sense of its being created through the experience. Rather, in the contemplative instance ignorance is removed and in the aesthetic instance the experience of the beautiful is suggested.

Thus in both no new dimension arises but a dimension hitherto unknown is <u>revealed</u>. The important point is that although it is man who involves himself in a mental discipline or in attendance at a drama, it is nevertheless Śiva who manifests the new dimension. This is true in both cases. It is an experience of grace.

5. In the Trika School as evidenced in the <u>Tantrasāra</u>, chapter four, imperfect knowledge (<u>vidyā</u>) must be replaced by Pure Wisdom (<u>sadvidyā</u>) through the destruction of diversity (<u>vikalpa</u>) in the Divine Power-Means to liberation. Similarly, in the suggestion of aesthetic experience (<u>rasanispattih</u>) Abhinava stresses that the obstacles (<u>vighnas</u>) must be destroyed before aesthetic experience can fully emerge.

6. In both instances, there is a sense of repose (<u>viśrānti</u>) and of fruition which lacks nothing.[30]

The major differences are:

1. The qualified person in the case of liberation is more strictly defined than he is for appreciating a drama. Even children may watch a drama, although they usually do not have the mature appreciative powers of adults. Nevertheless, aesthetic sensibility or being endowed with a heart (<u>sahrdayatva</u>) is a more empirical and concrete qualification than is the desire for final emancipation (<u>mumukṣa</u>).

2. When one has a profound aesthetic experience, it is simply satisfying. Mystical experience, however, is usually transformative.

3. It is important that theoreticians, excluding Abhinava (and perhaps a few others) do not use the word <u>ānanda</u> (bliss) to describe the purpose of poetry. They use, for the most part, the words <u>prīti</u> (pleasure) and <u>vinoda</u> (entertainment).

4. In one place Abhinava writes that aesthetic experience differs from yogic because the former has sensual contact with objects whereas the latter does not.[31]

---

[30] Masson and Patwardhan, <u>Śāntarasa</u>, pp. 161-2, first sentence of #5 added.

[31] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 162.

> This remark apparently contradicts the position that <u>rasa</u> and <u>śakti</u> are one.

Are these four differences cogent enough to invalidate the six similarities? The first of them argues that the desire for final emancipation is only evident in those aspirants who meditate according to enjoined rules. In other words, this difference discloses an exclusivist bent: liberation only through contemplative union. Accordingly, the existence of aesthetic sensibility, since it does not necessarily issue in a liberative discipline, is suspect. Hence, aesthetic sensibility has more of an empirical turn than the desire for final release. Against this I note that Abhinava's treatment of <u>śāntarasa</u> indicates a highly developed aesthetic sensibility in the sensitive reader which predisposes him to the experience of liberation. The second difference also denies the transformative aspect of aesthetic experience. In <u>śāntarasa</u>, however, this metamorphosis is accounted for. The third difference argues that since most writers use "pleasure" or "entertainment" to describe poetry's purpose, Abhinava's use of "bliss" is a minor moment. In other words, in light of the general consensus that pleasure and entertainment are the object of poetry, Abhinava's offering bliss as its object can not be serious. But, on the contrary, it is precisely Abhinava's distinction to point out this transcendent enjoyment as poetry's purpose.

The fourth difference distinguishes aesthetic experience from the mystical on two counts: (a) mystical experience has no contact with any sensual <u>object</u>, whereas the aesthetic

does -- for example, the characters in the drama; (b) mystical experience is inextricably linked to the object of contemplation whereas the aesthetic rises above the determinants, consequents and transient emotions considered as objects. Answering the first point it may be explained that aesthetic experience, in its deepest sense as śāntarasa, also has no contact with any sensual object -- for it is the tasting of the very basis of the emotions, Śiva's bliss. Hence as this total subjectivity it is similar to mystical experience. To the second point it may be remarked that mystical experience is linked to the contemplative object only in its initial discipline; in its completion it is the opening up of one's total subjectivity. Hence it too, just as aesthetic experience, rises above objectivity through profoundly realizing one's subjectivity.

This second rejoinder, that mystical experience in its fullness is not linked to the contemplative object, can also be seen in Abhinava's description of pure experience:

> The nature of this knowledge is as follows: it is free from all the limited principles -- beginning with the earth and stopping before Śiva -- and it is constituted of pure unlimited consciousness. This is the Supreme Reality, the stability of things and the vital principle of the universe. By it everything breathes and it is what I myself really am. So I am truly the very self of the universe, but in essence transcending it.[32]

Here Abhinava clearly states that man and Śiva are identical, that man's perfect subjectivity is Śiva. Since he explains that this mystical experience lacks any link to the contemplative

---

[32]See appendix.

object, but is rather a complete self-realization, it is similar to aesthetic perception which also stresses the subjective.

The first retort to the fourth difference -- that rasa does not contact sensual objects -- is illustrated in Abhinava's concept of śāntarasa, the penetration of emotional consciousness devoid of touch with any sensual object. We have already seen that in the chapter on śāntarasa in the Abhinava Bhāratī Abhinava states that the Self alone possessed of bliss and unlinked to sense-objects is the permanent emotion of the sentiment of tranquillity.[33] Thus the fruition of this sentiment's permanent emotion -- rasa at its highest level -- is the full realization of one's Self in divine union. This brings into sharp focus the importance of śāntarasa for the complete understanding of the rasa-śakti relation.

(5) LATER CONFIRMATION OF ŚĀNTARASA'S TRANSCENDENCE

The supranormality of śāntarasa, so clearly inferable from Abhinava's considerations, is also attested by the fact of its acceptance by two subsequent aestheticians of renown who acknowledged Abhinava as their master. Both of these thinkers, themselves non-theologians, were not always explicit in their remarks, as Viśvanātha. But one was, Jagannātha.

---

[33]See Masson and Patwardhan Śāntarasa, pp. 130-131.

Let us first consider Viśvanātha's reflections in his Sāhityadarpaṇa (Mirror of Poetry). The determinants of śānta-rasa, he tells us, are holy hermitages, sacred places and retreats of pilgrimage; its consequents are shuddering sensations; its transient emotions are recollection, resolve and kindness towards all beings; its permanent emotion is serenity (śama). Viśvanātha's example of a blissful mendicant also illustrates serenity;

> When will the crows fearlessly carry away the food placed as alms in my joined hands, as I move along the highway wearing an old, worn-out, tattered and inadequate garment, looked at by the citizens on the road with fear, curiosity and pity, sleeping in the unfeigned bliss of relishing the nectar of spirituality?[34]

This description evokes a peaceful picture; may it not intimate the sentiment of tranquillity? The phrase, "relishing the nectar of spirituality", probably suggests the experience of liberation.

Jagannātha's remarks in his Rasagaṅgādhara (Bearer of the Ganges of Rasa) explicitly support śāntarasa's mystical dimension:

> . . . because of the enjoyment of the vibhāvas, anubhāvas, and vyabhicāribhāvas, which enjoyment is evoked . . . by the sympathetic attitude of the appreciative reader or spectator, the mind of the appreciative reader or spectator dwelling on the various sthāyibhāvas, becomes transformed into the blissful consciousness which is the nature of the ātman, just as in the case of a Yogin, his mind

---

[34]Viśvanātha, Sāhityadarpaṇa III, 246 in ibid., p. 167, which uses Paricchedas I, III and X, edited by P. V. Kane, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, fifth edition, 1965.

> becomes transformed into blissful consciousness during deep meditation (samādhi).[35]

Here Jagannātha makes a clear comparison between the aesthetic and yogic state. If it be objected that Jagannatha does not specifically mention the sthāyibhāva tattvajnāna (the permanent emotion, knowledge of the truth), which is for Abhinava śānta-rasa's sthāyibhāva, it should be pointed out that Jagannātha is purely an aesthetician; he does not directly and for their own sake discuss theological issues, such as what constitutes knowledge of the truth. Even were he to do so, being a votary of the Vallabha school, his religious postulates would not accord with Abhinava's. Nevertheless Jagannātha does draw a parallel between rasa and mystical experience; so his views on rasa's mystical aspect can be understood in a sense not very different from Abhinava's on śāntarasa's liberative dimension.

But Jagannātha also confirms śāntarasa's transcendence by equating the mystical and aesthetic perceptions. First he gives the evidence of the Bhagavadgītā 6, 21, to illustrate contemplative bliss:

> That in which he finds this supreme delight, perceived by the intelligence and beyond the reach of the senses, wherein established he no longer falls away from the truth.[36]

---

[35]Rasagangādhara, Kavyamala edition of 1939, 25-27, in ibid., p. 175, as quoted by Masson and Patwardhan.

[36]Translation of S. Radhakrishnan (The Principal Upanisads) of Sanskrit text cited in part by Jagannātha; quoted by Masson and Patwardhan in Śāntarasa, p. 177.

According to him this passage shows that the tasting of divinity is full of happiness which is supersensible, "which is perceptible directly by . . . (intuition) and which transcends every other kind of mundane joy."[37] Second he cites Taittīriyopaniṣad 2, 7, to describe aesthetic bliss:

> He (the Self) surely is rasa, having realized rasa one becomes supremely happy.[38]

Thus Jagannātha understands that the bliss of the contemplative and aesthetic experience is the same, which is precisely Abhinava's position. But he also thinks that śāntarasa is a ninth rasa equal to yet separate from the other eight. On the one hand this contradicts Abhinava's position that it is the basis of all the eight rasas; on the other it agrees with Abhinava's teaching that śāntarasa is distinctly enjoyable. Consequently, Jagannātha's designation of rasa as mystical also invests the specific rasa of śānta with the same quality.

To conclude, it is apparent that Abhinava's writings demonstrate conflicting views regarding rasa's relation with śakti. However the tone of his aesthetic treatises greatly suggests the transcendence (alaukikatva) of rasa, a view arguing for its identification with śakti. This is further buttressed by Abhinava's last insights, as instanced in the Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vivṛti Vimarśinī, which designates two levels for

---

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ibid.— raso vai saḥ rasam hy evāyam labdhvā ānandī bhavati

mystical experience: (1) vyatireka turīyatīta -- with objectivity persisting in the subconscious; (2) avyatireka turīyatīta -- with objectivity expelled. Since Abhinava had divided the aesthetic experience under the eight rasas generally and under śāntarasa particularly, the conforming of this dual aesthetic level to his dual mystical level naturally follows. This bespeaks the admission of the mystical dimension in rasa. In addition, both in the general mystical categories of the Trika Śaiva school and in the specific constituents of the aesthetic experience, there are definite equations. For instance, self-consciousness (vimarśa) is equivalent to astonishment (camatkāra), and Pure Wisdom (sadvidyā) is tantamount to poetic imagination or a divine impulse manifesting Śiva (pratibhā). Abhinava's identification of mystical and aesthetic experience is therefore unassailable; just as śakti effects liberation, so does śāntarasa.

CHAPTER V

A CONTRAST WITH ŚAKTI IN TAMIL SIDDHĀNTA

Now that we have seen both the contemplative and aesthetic aspects of śakti in Abhinavagupta's works, it is helpful to contrast his concept of Divine Power with that of the Tamil school, the second major Śaiva tradition. Let us begin by investigating the Tamil sources of revelation.

(1) SOURCES

Revelation, for the Trika and Tamil Siddhānta, is comprehended in the Vedas and Āgamas. But the truth they articulate, the Siddhānta believes, is crystallized in its own doctrine.[1] And "while the Vedas are general and meant for all", as Aruḷnanti, a prominent Tamil theologian remarks, "the Āgamas are special and revealed for the benefit of the blessed and they contain the essential truths of the Vedas and the Vedānta."[2] The sources of the Tamil Siddhānta which differ

---

[1]John H. Piet. A Logical Presentation of the Śaiva Siddhānta Philosophy, Indian Research Series VIII, Madras: Christian Literature Society for India, 1952, p. 1.

[2]Śivañāna Cittiyār 8.15, cited in Mariasusai Dhavamony. Love of God According to Śaiva Siddhānta. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1971, p. 4.

from the Trika's are the twelve series of poems, the Tirumurai, and fourteen works of various mystical writers, the most famous of whom is Meykaṇṭa Tēvar. His significance is shown in the Siddhānta analogy that "the Vedas are the cow, the Āgamas the milk, the hymns of the . . . poets the butter and Meykaṇṭa's treatise (Śivañānapōtam) the taste of the butter."[3]

The poems of the Tamil Siddhānta were compiled in the tenth century of the Christian era. They express the belief that devotion (bhakti) is the only efficacious means to liberation and they praise Śiva for his grace. One of them, Māṇikkavācakar's Tiruvācakam is so moving for Tamilians that one of their common proverbs chides: "he who is not melted by the Tiruvācakam must have a stone for a heart."[4] The Tamil Siddhānta's theological treatises, dating from A. D. 1150 to 1325, also treat of man's devotion and God's grace.

The sources peculiar to the Trika system date from the ninth through the eleventh century of the Christian epoch. They include sixty-four anonymous works, Tantras, of which, as I noted in Chapter I, the Mālinīvijaya is the most important,[5] and texts of known authors, as for example Somānanda's Pratyabhijñā Śāstra and Vasugupta's Śiva Sūtras. Like the Tamil

---

[3] An old proverb cited in S. Kulandran. Grace: A Comparative Study of the Doctrine in Christianity and Hinduism. London: Lutterworth, 1964, p. 203.

[4] Dhavamony, op. cit., p. 158.

[5] Śivañānapōtam 1.2, cited in ibid., p. 204.

Siddhānta, the Trika system had its share of poets and its own discussion of grace. But for the Trika grace is Śiva's will (svatāntrya), identical with his Power (śakti); it is the monistic recognition of oneself as Śiva.

The bhakti motif proper to the poems of the Tamil Siddhānta was systematically expressed in the works of its theologians. Taking over the bhedābheda metaphysical structure furnished by the monist Śaiva scriptures (analyzed in chapter I) and that elaborated by earlier Sanskrit Śaiva Siddhāntins like Bhoja, they adapted it with some modification, to their devotion-oriented soteriology. This shall be our next topic of consideration.

(2) THE METAPHYSICAL EXPOSITION

Both Meykaṇṭa Tēvar and Aruḷnanti, echoing the arguments of the Nyāya theologians (themselves Śaivas), state that God, pure Intelligence, is the cause of the world. The universe has an intelligent cause, because it is an effect, like a pot.[6] Because the universe exists in Śiva, the ultimate reality, it also must be real. The world subsists in two modalities -- germinally within Śiva, its cause and empirically as an effect.

For Abhinava also the world is real because it is Śiva's experience; for him too it is a change from a causal

---

[6] Ibid., p. 203. This is the Nyaya syllogism demonstrating existence Kṣityādi sakartṛkam, kāryatvat ghaṭavat.

state to that of being an effect. But the Tamil school considers the world apart from the soul whereas for the Trika they are identical, with the former being the exterior projection of the latter.

Aruḷnanti explains the soul's nature from the Siddhānta's perspective:

> Souls eternally exist, like Siva himself, and are called satasat, because they are neither purely sat, which is God, nor purely asat, which is matter, but participate in both. The subtle states of the soul are three: kevala, sakala, and śuddha. In the kevala condition the soul is formless . . . unable to enjoy the fruits of karma . . . and immersed in āṇava. The sakala state is attributed to the soul in its condition of embodiment. The soul desiring to experience sense-objects undergoes as a result of this experience the chain of rebirths in accordance with karma. . . . in the śuddha state the soul becomes pervious to the descent of grace and obtains the grace of true wisdom.[7]

The relationship of souls to God has three phases or conditions, (1) isolation (kevala); (2) bondage (sakala) and (3) liberation (śuddha). In the first condition the soul possesses āṇava, that impurity which obscures by nourishing desire and self-love[8] and which leaves it unembodied and fettered. In the second condition God provides the soul both with a body and with objects of experience through māyai, which is the material principle of the body and the universe.[9] In this state the soul can undergo metempsychosis until through God's grace it attains the disposition to liberation and ultimately, in the third condition,

---

[7] Śivañāna Cittiyār 7.2-7.3 in ibid., pp. 232-233.

[8] Umpāti, Śivap Pirakācam, 20, in ibid., p. 349.

[9] Ibid., p. 204, note 2.

liberation itself. Śiva's five functions of creation, sustenation, dissolution, concealment and grace are munificent because they furnish the soul with a means of obtaining good karma, grace and liberation. Aruḷnanti's dualism strongly contrasts with Abhinava's monistic postulation that the soul is Śiva's self-distortion, and Aruḷnanti's threefold condition of the soul with Abhinava's dual state of bondage and liberation.

As for śakti, Meykaṇṭa Tēvar states that it is inseparable from Śiva just as an attribute is from its substance or sunlight from the sun.[10] Śiva and śakti, although one in being, are nevertheless distinct. (In standard Vedānta terms there is between them a bhedābheda relationship.) This distinction is evident in śakti's active nature. As Śivaňāna Yōgi writes:

> The absolute character of God is safeguarded from change, and contingency since his union with souls is effected by his Śakti, and everything is produced by the mere volition of his Śakti.[11]

Śakti is both non-different and different from Śiva: as non-different it shares divine being and as different it mediates between Śiva and souls. Although Abhinava's concept of śakti shares the same dialectic, its primary purpose is the veiling of Śiva as man and the world and the unmasking of man and the world as Śiva. Consequently, for the realist Siddhānta, śakti unites two discrete beings, while for the idealist Trika śakti

---

[10] Śivaňānapōtam 2.4 in ibid., p. 207.

[11] Commentary on Śivaňānapōtam 5.2.2. in ibid., p. 213.

refers to one being in two conditions -- that of being non-intuited (man) and intuited (Śiva).

Elaborating the notion of śakti, Aruḷnanti remarks that in the three periods of creation, maintenance and dissolution, it assumes five different names: sadāśivam, vidyā, maheśvara, śiva and śakti. In the period of creation (1) when knowledge and action are equally balanced śakti is sadāśivam. During the periods of maintenance and dissolution knowledge and action are not balanced and each predominates alternately. In the former period (2) when knowledge is preponderant, śakti is vidyā, and (3) when action gains ascendancy, maheśvara. In the latter period (4) when knowledge predominates, śakti is Śiva, and (5) when action prevails, it is called śakti.[12] Despite apparent similarity to Abhinava's five transcendental categories, this pentad differs in three respects: (a) its context of creation-maintenance-destruction contrasts with the pure state of Abhinava's categories; (b) its antithesis of knowledge and action with that of the Trika's subject and object; (c) its balance of its own antithesis which is sadāśivam (the first manifestation of empirical being) contrasts with that of the Trika's balance which is sadvidyā (Pure Wisdom).

The Tamil Siddhānta also posits the ontological immanence of śakti in the soul. God's power is present in each soul as its instrumental cause; the soul's activity depends

---

[12] Śivañāna Cittiyār 1.64 in ibid., p. 228.

on this power; śakti is inseparable from the soul as its permanent ground,[13] as the eye and sunlight are in sight: the soul is the eye while Śiva is the sunlight.[14] God operates in the soul through his power of grace (aruḷcatti) to save it from the triple impurity of āṇava, karma and māyai.[15] Hence by the very fact of creation God's grace inheres in the soul linking it to himself.

Śakti as grace guides the soul to the fullness of light, liberation. But the sustained desire to maintain Śiva's transcendence over against his immanence appears in the analogy of the sun and the lotus:

> Just as in the presence of the shining sun one lotus flower blossoms, one is just budding and one withers, so also God does not experience any change in his thought by his creative activity and therefore apparently successive volitions (such as those of grace) in no way qualify him.[16]

For Abhinava, although śakti is intrinsic to the soul, it is so (as I have often said) primarily as a veiling non-intuition of divinity which becomes unmasked in liberation. In fact, his descriptions of śakti (grace) are always correlated with the dawning of liberating Self-recognition:

> Hence only those struck by the relentless hurl of Śiva's power, and who have had their discursive

---

[13] Śivañāna Cittiyār 2.5-6 in ibid., p. 343.

[14] Tiruvaruṭpayan 1.1. in ibid., p. 276.

[15] Irupāvirupatu 2.12 in Ibid., p. 246.

[16] Śivap Pirakācam 17.6-8., in ibid., pp. 263-4, parentheses added.

> knowledge purified in degrees with the aid of the right scriptures and such other means, are able to enter the Supreme Reality.[17]

Abhinava's *śakti* as grace is not an ontological bridge between two distinct entities, God and man, and if the soul is divine, it is not so on account of its union with divine grace, but rather because of its identity with Śiva. In addition, Abhinava does not stress Śiva's detachment from the world except to say that Supreme Śiva is ineffable. On the contrary, as I have previously shown, his treatment of *śakti* as the contemplative vision of bliss returning the limited soul to plenary consciousness, underscores the empirical aspect of God's power.

The Tamil Siddhānta believes that the soul's ontological connection with divinity both warrants grace and depends on it. On the one hand, because the soul is eternally inseparable from God, grace is proper to its nature. On the other, without the assistance of Śiva's five activities, especially his liberating grace, the soul cannot purify itself. Śiva brings *saṁsāra* into existence for the sole purpose of affording the soul the grace of liberation. From its embodied state through its unembodied the soul is continuously joined to God's grace.

Abhinava's idea that grace purifies discursive cognition compares with Aruḷnanti's that liberating grace destroys defilements. But Abhinava differs by understanding that the soul is not united to God by grace; the soul is God, albeit hidden from

---

[17] *Tantrasāra*, p. 23, see appendix. (chapter four)

himself; hence grace is primarily the intuition of one's own divinity.

(3) GRACE AND DEVOTION (BHAKTI)

This brings us to the Siddhānta's doctrine of grace, in the discussion of which we will see four major points of contrast between its concept of śakti and the Trika's: (1) Tamil śakti is primarily aruḷcatti, or God's love as grace, particularly that of liberation; Trika's śakti is blissful self-realization. (2) The former notion conduces to a devotional and effusive attitude whereas the latter leads to peace and self-containment. (3) Tamil meditation causes a deep coalescence between two distinct beings, God and man; Trika's contemplative ascesis effects a monistic recognition of one's own divinity. (4) Tamil śakti as aruḷcatti stresses God's loving intervention; Trika śakti underscores man's own effort (although set in motion by the hard hurl of Śiva's Power).

Aruḷnanti describes grace as a multiple attribute of the Godhead. He writes of Śiva that:

> His form is grace, his attributes are grace,
> His functions arise from grace, his limbs are grace;
> And his grace is for all the souls and not for himself.[18]

The soul ontologically participates in this grace through which God essentially penetrates the soul, and which ensures the soul's

---

[18] Śivañāna Cittiyār 1.47 as cited in S. Kulandran, op. cit., p. 208.

further assimilation into the divine. Believing that God alone can effect liberation, the Siddhāntin eschews his own effort towards the goal to seek God's favor. Meykaṇṭa Tēvar states that

> only by seeing God, and being helped by his grace, is the soul enabled to realize its true nature.[19]

Thus the postulate that the soul is ontologically inseparable from God leads to the deep religious sense of dependence on him -- expressed in its supplication for his favor.

This piety is initiated by God's power inspiring the soul. As the Mṛgendrāgama puts it:

> By the descent of grace upon them *bhakti* is engendered in souls --[20]

an idea which compares with that of Abhinava's, according to which "only those struck by the relentless hurl of Śiva's power . . . are able to enter into the Supreme Reality." Śiva intends to lead the soul to liberation through its progressive devotional response. God's call and the soul's answer together evoke the liberating grace, effecting the realization of God's intimate union with the soul. This is the blissful experience of the soul's actual participation in divine life. The grace which Śiva confers on the soul is the understanding of God's great love which itself evokes man's response. Consequently it is not only emotional effusion, but a continuously enhanced

---

19 *Śivañānapōtam* 9.1.1. as cited by Dhavamony, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

20 *Mṛgendrāgama* 5.4. cited in *ibid.*, p. 120.

consciousness of God's love, that expresses its delight in this all-giving Being. Wisdom and love unite in falling in adoration before and seeking unity with Śiva.

The soul, on its part, becomes dedicated to Śiva, so as "to cling to the Lord's feet", and "to beg for the grace of melting one's heart and mind."[21] The first phrase, from the Tirukkuṟal, one of the earliest Dravidian writings, and the second, from the Tiruvācakam, the most poignant Tamil poem, express both humility and the longing for rapture. And Māṇikkavācakar rhapsodically prays:

> Give me grace that ceaseless love for you may abide in the inmost of my heart, melting (in love) my very soul.[22]

He is cognizant of his need for the touch of divine life which quickens his ontological union into an intuitive one. His passionate longing for Śiva's grace reaches its consummation when he writes:

> I ask not kin, nor name, nor place
> Nor learned men's society
> Men's lore for me no value has
> Kūttalam's lord, I come to Thee.
>
> Wilt thou one boon on me bestow,
> A heart to melt in longing sweet
> As yearn o'er new born calf the cow
> In yearning for Thy sacred feet?[23]

These poems understandably find no parallel in Abhinavagupta's

---

[21] Tiruvācakam 5.11 in ibid., p. 163.

[22] Ibid.

[23] F. Kingsbury and G. E. Phillips, Trs. Hymns of the Tamil Saivite Saints. London: Oxford University Press, 1921, p. 125.

thought. Neither the Kashmiri theologian nor any poet of the Trika persuasion could express himself with a like devotional warmth because the Trika teaching does not exalt bhakti due to its recognition of the partial efficacy of man's own effort in contemplative discipline and in aesthetic experience.

The Tamil school also defines liberation in triple fashion. It is: (1) the apex of devotion; (2) surrender to Śiva; (3) union with him. Regarding the first meaning, Meykaṇṭa Tēvar says:

> love of Hara makes souls able never to forget him, i.e. constantly know him and be united with him,[24]

and Māṇikkavācakar agrees:

> Love joined me to your feet in mystic union. . . .[25]

The means and end of liberation are the same -- devotion. It is important that the distinctive grace of liberation which Śiva imparts to the soul is aruḷcatti, God's power as grace; it is the communication of God's love to the soul in realized union,[26] the clear vision of what had been previously murky in God's initiating grace. Concerning the second definition, Meykaṇṭa Tēvar writes that freed souls remain subject to Śiva and are in many ways his servants.[27] With respect to the third, he asserts that God becomes inseparably united with the

---

[24] Śivañānapōtam 11.2 in Dhavamony, op. cit., p. 222.

[25] Tiruvācakam 5.71 in ibid., p. 362.

[26] Śivap Pirakācam, 50 in ibid., p. 274.

[27] Śivañānapōtam 1.3.3. in ibid., p. 222.

soul when the soul lovingly contemplates him.[28]

Abhinava does not share any of these notions. His concept of liberation sees śakti as the contemplative understanding that "I am Śiva." Śiva and man are identical, not just united. We now confront the clearest point of contrast between the two systems -- the relation of God and the soul in liberation.

(4) THE RELATION OF ŚIVA AND THE SOUL IN LIBERATION

Meykaṇṭa Tēvar holds that in liberation God is one with souls but also different from them: one as the soul is with the body, different as the sun and eye in vision.[29] For Meykaṇṭa this dual relationship is advaita, "not two."[30] He dismisses the interpretation of this word as "one" because the thought of one, since it is discursive, is already two: There is the thinker and the thought. Meykanta writes that

> God who is one with the soul, is not the soul itself; God can be one with the soul, but the soul can not become God.[31]

And that

> the moment when the soul realizes that Śiva has always stood in an advaita relation with itself and

---

[28] Ibid., 2.1.4., p. 223.

[29] Śivañānapōtam 1.70 in ibid., p. 350.

[30] Ibid., 2.1., p. 205.

[31] Ibid., 2.1.1., p. 350, emphasis added.

> that Śiva has been and is thereby the Prime Mover of all, . . . the soul accordingly makes its adjustment by surrendering itself to His will. . . .[32]

To explain this relation of God and the soul, Umāpati, another Siddhāntin, introduces the idea of a mystical marriage:

> As two women can not be united in marital love but only human beings of opposite sexes, so the soul (mystic bride) through grace can be united in love with God (the mystic bridegroom).[33]

But concomitant with their disjunction is their union through love -- Śiva's initiating grace and the soul's spontaneous response.

Māṇikkavācakar also illustrates this dual theme of union and distinction:

> This state (of supreme bliss) can not be attained unless my Lord enters into me. Entering within my breast he (God) made me his.

and

> What you (God) have given is you, and what you have gained is me.[34]

Within Tamil Siddhanta's theological exposition, which culminates in this dualistic relation of God and man in liberation, let us now summarize śakti's role. I have already indicated six of its aspects:

1. It is the instrumental cause of the world.
2. It is inseparable from Śiva as sun from sunlight.

---

[32] Śivañānapōtam 10 as cited in Piet, op. cit., p. 42.

[33] Tiruvarutpayan (Fruit of Divine Grace) 8.2 in Dhavamony, op. cit., pp. 284-5.

[34] Tiruvācakam 49.2, 13.17 and 22.10 in ibid., pp. 360 and 169; emphasis added by Dhavamony, retained by me.

3. It is the interior dynamism of Śiva.
4. It is Śiva's mediatorial power vis-à-vis the world.
5. It is Śiva's grace ontologically united with the soul.
6. As a more specific aspect of its mediatorial function, it is Śiva's power to perform the five actions of creation, preservation, destruction, concealment and the bestowal of the grace of liberation.

This last activity is most pronounced in the works both of the poets and of the theologians. And there are good reasons for believing that liberating grace is the crucial aspect of <u>śakti</u>. Since the Siddhānta postulates God's ontological immanence in the soul through grace, this unrealized union can appropriately be manifested to the soul only through the same unifying means. Śiva's power of grace -- a specific form of <u>śakti</u> (<u>aruḷcatti</u>) -- descends on the devotee in liberation, and the intimate ontological union of God and the soul is mystically realized, although without fusion of identities. Since this liberating grace is an aspect of <u>śakti</u>, inseparable from Śiva, it may be said that <u>aruḷcatti</u> unites the soul with Śiva; hence <u>aruḷcatti</u> is the means to contemplative union.

Abhinava agrees with the Tamil concept of <u>śakti</u> in its first four aspects. But the fifth and sixth aspect constitute the matrix of the Tamil school's devotional orientation. To them Abhinava does not accede, for their underlying assumptions -- Śiva's distinction from man and his connection with man through grace -- contradict the Trika's monistic position.

Abhinava does not greatly discuss grace in itself because such a treatment would call attention to the point of its origin, God as other, a tenet which he finds unacceptable.

In sum, the contrast between Tamil Siddhānta's notion of śakti and Abhinava's lies in the latter's unique concern with the peaceful self-realization attainable to some extent through man's own efforts in contemplative discipline and in the aesthetic experience of quietude.

RECAPITULATION

We have seen that from the inception of the worship of Śiva from about the end of the fourth milennium B.C. until almost the end of the first milennium A.D. no distinguished Śaiva systematic theologian emerged. Around that date, in Abhinavagupta, Śaivism gained its first great thinker. The Kashmiri _ācārya_ shaped his theory of liberation in close connection with his concept of Divine Power, an idea first expressed in the _Śvetāśvatara_ _Upaniṣad_. He defined this Power as the means whereby God veils his majesty to experience himself as man and the world and also as the way of man's recognizing his true divinity. In elaborating Divine Power's revealing side Abhinava disclosed two equally important aspects, the contemplative and the aesthetic.

The first aspect is evident in three means to liberation taught by the Trika School: Divine Power-Means, Śiva-Means and Means-Without-Means. Focusing on the Divine Power-Means, Abhinava discussed Śiva's Twelve Śaktis, who are his goddesses, the divisions of his Power, which itself is but his hypostasis. These Śaktis are Śiva's circular manifestation in contemplative consciousness and the revelation of God's liberating grace. Assuming such concrete forms as Kālī, the

Temptress and the Terrifying Goddess, they appear in a whirling circle of light and cause the devotee to recognize himself as the Lord.

Divine Power's second aspect is manifest in the sentiment of tranquillity. Abhinava demonstrated that the transcendental basis of aesthetic perception is the Self -- Śiva. The experience of Śiva -- liberation -- may be realized through watching a drama or reading a poem which suggests the sentiment of tranquillity. The permanent emotion of this sentiment is knowledge of the Self; when this knowledge is realized through the determinants, consequents and transient emotions, liberation ensues.

In describing both the contemplative and aesthetic experiences, Abhinava used at least three terms of identical meaning -- camatkāra, pratibhā, viśrānti -- thus equating the two perceptions. He also postulated a two-level structure of aesthetic experience -- the first requiring latent impressions of objective experiences (rasa) and the second (śāntarasa) not -- with the former passing into the latter (a mystical experience of liberation). In experiencing the sentiment of tranquillity, the sensitive aesthete recognizes himself as Śiva just as the devotee does in contemplative discipline.

Śiva's liberating Power may therefore be attained both in meditative ascesis and in the aesthetic experience of tranquillity, which itself is contemplatively nuanced. And although Śiva's Power as grace appears in meditation as the

rotating mandala of twelve goddesses, Abhinava does not emphasize its gratuitousness. Rather, in both contemplation and aesthetic perception he calls attention to the monistic intuition of oneself as the Supreme Śiva. For Abhinava therefore *śakti* uncovers man's full reality as God.

The Tamil Siddhanta's understanding of the same concept is quite different from Abhinava's. Although the former's primary emphasis is also contemplative, the object of meditation is not monistic apprehension of one's divinity but further understanding of God's love for man. Though Śiva and man are distinct, man can progressively approach Śiva through his grace, which is the ontological basis of man's soul. Believing that God is all-gracious, the devotee eschews his own efforts for liberation and seeks God's grace instead. He acknowledges his dependence on God, becomes devoted to him and begs to cling to his feet. Even in liberation the soul is intensely absorbed in loving God, as is so movingly expressed in Māṇikkavācakar's poetry. Consequently, for the Tamil Śaivas *śakti* illustrates love of God. Whereas Abhinava's contemplative union is peaceful and self-contained, Tamil Siddhānta's is loving and effusive. Abhinava's *śakti* effects monistic recognition but the Tamil Siddhānta's causes an intense union between two distinct beings, God and man. And while Trika acknowledges man's effort on the way to liberation, for Tamil Siddhānta this effort is even less recognized, Śiva's grace being almost wholly efficacious for liberation.

In sum, Abhinava's concept of <u>śakti</u> stresses monistic absorption in God's tranquillity which is realized in two ways: (1) through the perception of the sentiment of tranquillity; (2) through the appearance of the Twelve Śaktis in the Divine Power-Means to liberation. The first way aesthetically occasions liberation through the delightful means of dramatic and poetic experience and the second attains the same goal through the severe means of yogic discipline. Abhinava's cogent explication of the mystical aspect of aesthetic experience, together with his description of contemplative experience proper, may be considered one of the summits of Indian theological achievement.

EPILOGUE: A THEOLOGY OF KENOSIS

> For the divine nature was his
> from the first; yet he did not
> prize his equality with God,
> but made himself nothing,
> assuming the nature of a slave.
>
> St. Paul, Philippians 2, 6-7

We are now in a position to compare Abhinava's theology with some other theologies, especially of Catholicism, perhaps the nearest of all religions to Hinduism, and not least in theological fecundity; of Eastern Orthodox Christianity, so like it in contemplative character; and of Islam, perhaps furthest in spirit from Hinduism, but so near it in the kind of theological systematization that the orthodoxies of both religions came to adopt.

Theologies concern themselves with the absolutely transcendent and concentrate their attention on its positive characteristic of plenitude (pūrṇatva or pleroma), or on its negative one of incomprehensibility (śūnyatā or kenotes), which is only plenitude considered as ineffable. But, less often, do their ideas turn to a plenitude that, as it were, empties itself, in order thereby to render itself paradoxically more plenteous.

In other words, there are fewer theologies of kenosis than of pleroma or kenotes; and among "kenotic" theologies, Abhinava's is surely the most profound. Traditional Catholic theology is precluded from developing a kenotic character by

its dogmatic and philosophical presuppositions. Dogmatic, because God, in the words of Vatican I, is

> infinite in all perfections, one . . . singular, wholly simple and unchangeable spiritual substance. . . .

and he creates:

> not to increase his perfection or to acquire it, but to manifest his perfection through the good things which he communicates to creatures.[1]

Philosophical, because it is impossible for God, Pure Act, ever to be in a state of potentiality, and hence of intellectual potentiality, which is the state that Abhinava's Supreme Śiva experiences before the functioning of his Power or _śakti_ begins. As one Catholic theologian, Suarez, says:

> The intellectual potency formally signifies the power or faculty of understanding and of receiving intellection; but in God there is no elicited or received intellection but an intellection that is of itself necessary and by itself subsistent; therefore an intellectual potency with respect to an intellection of this sort is not found in God; neither does this potency signify perfection absolutely, but includes imperfection, which is why it does not exist in God formally but only eminently.[2]

Nevertheless, the idea of _kenosis_ that Abhinava's theology embodies has resonances in Catholic writers, as, for instance, Bossuet, who declares that:

> It is a sufficiently astonishing truth and nonetheless a wholly indubitable one that among the infinite means God has of establishing his glory the most efficacious of all is found to be necessarily connected with lowness. He can overturn all nature, he can make

---

[1]Denzinger, _Enchiridion Symbolorum_ ##1782-1783.

[2]_Disputationes Metaphysicae_, disp. 30, sect. 15, n. 9.

> man see his power by a thousand new miracles; but through a marvellous secret he can not bear his grandeur higher then until he lowers and humiliates himself. . . . Let us say then with the prophet, "God has produced a novelty." What novelty has he produced? He has wished to lift his grandeur to its highest point. For that reason he has lowered himself. He has wished to show us his glory in its greatest light: vidimus gloriam eius; he has therefore clothed himself in our weakness: Et habitavit in nobis; et vidimus gloriam eius. One has hardly seen more of glory because one has never seen more of lowness.[3]

The very character of Abhinava's idealistic thought, where all differentiations are but ideational modalities in one transcendental mind, demands the identification of the theologies of God's pleroma and of his kenosis.

Precisely because it is idealist, with God's intellection as its basic concept, this thought touches the very characteristic of the deity that, according to traditional Catholic theology, constitutes its essence. In the words of Suarez:

> The divine knowledge is not only the very substance of God, but is formally of the essence of God himself and as though ultimately constituting it in the significance of its particular nature or essence.[4]

The desire of Abhinava's Supreme Śiva for the disclosure of the unmanifested world is comparable to God's knowledge of creatures because

> Although formally and precisely speaking God may not be blessed through his cognition or knowledge of

---

[3]Jacques-Benigne Bossuet. Deuxième sermon pour la fête de l' Annonciation. premier point.

[4]Disputationes Metaphysicae, disp. 30, sect. 15, n. 14.

> creatures, it really pertains to the perfection and happiness of God to have such a knowledge, by which he necessarily, and as though through a certain consequence, knows the possible creatures, once their possibility is presupposed.[5]

Knowledge of creatures is necessary for the perfection of God, "not because he needs them, but through the abundance of his proper and intrinsic perfection."[6]

However, the <u>kenosis</u> experienced by the Supreme Śiva is not an ontological metamorphosis or annihilation, but merely a change in the state of ideas. Reality itself, for the Trika, is no more than appearance, or a mass of ideas or images. The mind or consciousness cannot do without a variety of concepts and, "without them, without the variety of the world, consciousness would be only unmoved identity and hence would not be consciousness, but a thing."[7] The same is therefore true of the consciousness that is the Supreme Śiva. But, being the plenitude of being Śiva cannot lack the perfection of liberty -- like the Vedāntic Brahman, who is only being, consciousness and bliss -- and liberty is the power (<u>śakti</u>), as Abhinava holds, of negating oneself, of becoming something other than what one is. In his own words:

> Thought contains all things and of itself it produces another, and of another, itself. It unifies both and

---

[5]<u>Ibid</u>., 30, 15, 6.

[6]<u>Ibid</u>.

[7]Raniero Gnoli, <u>Essenza dei Tantra</u>. Torino: Boringhieri, 1960, p. 39.

having unified them immerses them in itself.[8]

and

> The liberty of the ego consists as much in differentiating what is not differentiated as in unifying in an interior synthesis whatever is differentiated. The five operations that tradition attributes to Śiva -- in other words, creation, maintenance, reabsorption, grace and obscuration -- are no more naturalistically considered as stages in a reality which independently and outside our consciousness is born, evolves and dies, but rather as moments in the consciousness of the ego which freely expresses itself through them as ego and consciousness.[9]

Thus the very systematic postulates of Abhinava's system, as I suggested, make his theology at once pleromatic and kenotic. One of its principal problems -- and of all other theologies which postulate a transcendent and infinitely perfect reality that is nevertheless subject to some sort of qualification -- is how to reconcile perfection and its limitation. A prominent solution distinguishes the limitable aspect of the transcendent from its illimitable one -- really distinct but ineffably identified -- the former called the transcendental essence and the latter its energies or powers. This distinction is first suggested in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad and clearly formulated in Bādarāyana's Brahma Sūtras, and is the basis of the main schools of Hindu theology, which accept the principle of bhedābheda or difference in identity. To my knowledge, this distinction is not found in the Greek philosophers and is

---

[8] Abhinavagupta, translated from Gnoli's Italian version in ibid.

[9] Ibid., p. 40.

nowhere made the foundation of a system in Hellenic thought. As the Orthodox theologian Mark of Ephesus observes:

> we do not find among the ancients any clear and defined distinction between the essence of God and His operation . . . in our time . . . the partisans of profane wisdom have created so much confusion in the Church over this question, and have even accused her of polytheism . . . . This is why theologians have insisted more on the simplicity of God than on the distinction which exists within him.[10]

This distinction was first clearly propounded in Orthodox theology by Gregorios Palamas. As another Gregorios (of Thessalonika) commenting on Palamas' thought, says:

> the divine nature must be said to be at the same time both exclusive of, and, in one sense, open to participation. We attain to participation in the divine nature, and yet, at the same time, it remains totally inaccessible.[11]

This double character of the deity, declares Lossky, compels us

> to recognize in God an ineffable distinction . . . between the essence of God, of His nature properly so-called, which is inaccessible, unknowable and incommunicable; and the energies or divine operation, forces proper to and inseparable from God's essence, in which he goes forth from Himself, manifests, communicates, and gives Himself.[12]

These energies, or _śaktis_, "signify an interior manifestation of the Trinity which cannot be interiorized",[13] and are, as Abhinava exclaims, "without number";[14] they manifest "the in-

---

[10]Vladimir Lossky, _The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church_. English translation published by James Clark and Co., London, 1857, p. 79.

[11]_Ibid._, P. 69.

[12]_Ibid._, p. 70.

[13]_Ibid._, p. 80.

[14]_Tantrasāra_, chapter four, see appendix.

numerable names of God . . . Wisdom, Life, Power, Justice, Love, Being, God -- and an infinity of other names which are unknown to us."[15] The unity of God, then, is not in every sense undivided. As Abhinava says, "Non-duality according to us does not in fact exclude multiplicity."[16] In fact, unity cannot exist without multiplicity. Bhaskara, one of the most important of bhedābheda theologians succinctly formulates it as a universal principle:

> difference is an attribute of identity (abhedadharmasca bhedaḥ)

and

> everything is at the same time unique and multiple, neither totally different, nor totally non-different (sarvamekanekātmakam nātyantābhinnam bhinnam va).

This basic theology of Hinduism was to be reincarnated in a most unlikely world, that of Eastern Orthodox Christianity.

Kenotic theology is found in other Hindu systems, besides that of Abhinava -- as for instance in the Vaiṣṇava Vedānta of Bhaskara, Nimbarka, Ramanuja, Vallabha and Caitanya. The only significant difference between these systems and the Trika is that the former are not idealist, and believe that the transformation of Brahman (God) occurs in reality, not indeed in that ultimate Reality's essence, but in its energies or modes. Vallabha, for instance, distinguishes between a modification that affects the essence of the thing to be modified (vikṛtapariṇāma) as the change of milk into curds results

---

[15]Lossky, op. cit., p. 80.

[16]Gnoli, op. cit., p. 42.

in the disappearance of the milk; and a modification that leaves the essence unaffected (avikṛtapariṇāma), as when gold is shaped into a bracelet, the gold remaining gold. The Brahman can be said to undergo the latter kind of transformation. Its perfection is manifest when its characteristics of Being, Consciousness and Bliss are unobscured; but the power of obscuration is in fact identical with the supreme Reality as one of its powers. When it obscures the characteristics of Bliss and Consciousness (leaving that of Being unclouded) we perceive the category of the material and perishable; when it obscures only Bliss (leaving Consciousness and Being uncovered) what we see are the individuals of the category of selves; and when all the characteristics are revealed, we have the Brahman (where Consciousness predominates) and Puruṣottama or Kṛṣṇa (where Bliss supervenes).

It is remarkable that this theology would again be reincarnated in a milieu even more unlikely than that of Orthodoxy. Islam -- a creationist faith inordinately zealous for God's dominion and unity -- was to accept a kenotic doctrine affirming the principle of identity-in-difference as the basis of its orthodox theology, a principle that had been used to justify a religion that in its eyes was pantheistic and idolatrous.

This process of transforming orthodox Islamic theology into one of bhedābheda was begun, as Zaehner has shown,[17]

---

[17]Robert C. Zaehner. Hindu and Muslim Mysticism. London: Athlone Press, 1970, chapters 5, 6 and 7.

through the mystic Abu Yazid's initiation into the esoteric doctrines of Upaniṣadic monism by his teacher Abu 'Ali al-Sindi, who seems to have been a converted Brahmin from Sind. Islamic theology, however, could never have become unqualifiedly monist, since it is blasphemy to identify God and creature totally. At the same time, it is possible for that theology to be in some sense non-dualist, and

> to deny existence of any sort to anything at all except God. This could be represented as the height of orthodoxy since the orthodox themselves who admitted the derived existence of created things could in their turn be accused of shirk [association of all that is not God with God] in that they allowed anything to 'partake' of being which belongs absolutely and exclusively to God.[18]

In other words, it would suit Islam well to have a theology of identity-in-difference.

This theology was provided by Islam's "Crown of Mystics", Abu'l-Qasim al-Junayd (died 910), one of his faith's most profound mystical theologians. It is based on two broad principles: (1) the preëxistence of souls in God from all eternity as his ideas, and (2) the two acts of annihilation (fanā) -- the first, whereby the souls lose their divine existence and acquire a separately creaturely one, and the second whereby this acquired existence is dissolved with the soul returning to its divine existence as an idea in God.

I shall now exemplify these principles mostly from Junayd's writings. When speaking of (1) the divine and ideal

---

[18] Robert C. Zaehner. Mysticism Sacred and Profane. Oxford at the University Press, 1957, pp. 159-160.

preëxistence of souls, Junayd uses the word to "exist" transitively. God, says Junayd:

> was 'existing' them (the souls), encompassing them, witnessing them in the beginning when they were no thing apart from their eternal being in which state they were from all pre-eternity -- and this is the divine existence and divine awareness which is proper to him alone. Therefore did we say that when he 'existed' man, causing his will to flow over him as he wished, endowing him with his most exalted attribute in which none can share this form of existence, that was without doubt the most perfect and the most efficacious moment.[19]

From all eternity, then, the souls possess the ideational existence postulated by Abhinava's theology. Then comes the moment of the creation of the souls (1a), which Junayd visualized as an emptying or annihilation, "their annihilation out of or after their eternal being."[20] In consequence, the soul acquires a separate consciousness, and there begins the separation from God, which is "itself the source of suffering -- and suffering willingly accepted . . . is one of the ways in which God leads the estranged soul back to himself."[21] As in most Hindu theologies, then, the soul is bound only to be liberated: "it is dipped in time and returns enriched by the experience of suffering for his sake."[22]

---

[19]Junayd, Kitab al-Fana, quoted in Zaehner, Hindu and Muslim Mysticism, pp. 146-147.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Zaehner, op. cit., p. 144.

[22]Ibid.

The second annihilation (1b) whereby all trace of the creature is obliterated and his creaturely existence passes away, begins with God's election of souls. This, like Abhinava's _śaktipāta_ (the descent of grace) is an overwhelming power, and (says Junayd) when God "overwhelms, he is perfect in his overwhelming."[23] God then reveals to them, in a flash of intuition, their own timeless being, and its unique relationship with God. They then

> experience bliss in him in a manner unseen as the most delightful form of existence though it is not a mode of existence at all as commonly understood, because it is God appropriating them and divine omnipotence overwhelming them.[24]

But this is only God's _makr_, the guile by which he deludes the mystic -- and here Junayd employs the concept of delusion as a soteriological device, so widely referred to in Hindu theologies. God deprives the souls of the brief vision, thus making them again

> present to their specific nature, and so they are separated from the commerce they had with him and he with them. So they grieve for themselves and grow used to their merely human nature, for God deprives them of this first fulfillment and most perfect grace, and they return to discursive thought and ratiocination. Grief settles upon them and the pang of loss abides with them, present as they are to themselves and their contingent existence.[25]

But the guile does not end there. God once again overwhelms them

---

[23]Junayd, _op. cit._, p. 220.

[24]_Ibid._, p. 221.

[25]_Ibid._

> to the discomfiture of their renascent human attributes. He thus puts a veil between him and them so that they give way to their ego, busy themselves with the senses, and delight in the contemplation of themselves, dwelling in pride, enjoying the fruits of their meditation overcome by omnipotence. He (God) causes them to take refuge from him in their own efforts, so that they exult and glory in their isolation.[26]

This is what the monist considers as liberation. However, God rids them of their self-complacency by making

> the annihilation that is within these souls' annihilation present to them, and shows them the existence that is within their existence.[27]

And that existence, of course, is the existence of God. In their awakening, "they behold the myriad glances that proceed from him so that the very destruction of their human individuality is itself drowned in the tide that flows over them in eternal being."[28]

Thus Junayd's theology is a Muslim replica, perhaps less complex and subtle, of the systematic thought of Abhinavagupta. There is however a significant difference, for in the Trika, multiplicity does not survive liberation, as it does not also in the thought of Bhaskara. But it does in liberation as Nimbarka conceives it, for Nimbarka, unlike Bhaskara, does not consider multiplicity and difference due to adventitious conditions (upādhi).

---

[26] Ibid., p. 223.

[27] Ibid., p. 222.

[28] Ibid., pp. 223-224.

Be that as it may our comparative study will not be complete if we restrict ourselves only to theologies that echo Abhinava's speculation or derive from it, and ignore those from which the great ācārya's own thinking originated. We have seen how it springs from the insights of the Vedas, Upaniṣads, Āgamas and Tantras. But its ontological character is unimaginable without Buddhism. For while its especial metaphysical postulates -- whether monist or qualifiedly monist (bhedābheda) -- are purely Upaniṣadic, its idealist character is almost wholly Yogācāra Buddhist. As Vasubandhu, the foremost Yogācārin, writes, "all that we see is nothing but consciousness. Objects are indeed appearances and do not in fact exist."[29] And the very postulates of Yogācāra find their logical conclusion in Trika, for

> while Buddhist idealism had distinguished the two moments of consciousness into direct perception which witnesses reality and into subjective representation which is discursive and which creates and perceives errors, the representatives of Trika, on the contrary, affirm that there is no qualitative difference between these two moments but only one of degree. The discursive moment or thought is none but the natural evolution or irradiation of the first. In the latter it abides already implicit and infused just as the peacock in all the varicolored splendor of its feathers is wholly present in potentiality within the egg.[30]

And the Trika salvation is but that of the Yogācāra -- "an act of cognition which no longer apprehends an object, an act of

---

[29]Translated from the Italian rendering of Gnoli, op. cit., pp. 21-22.

[30]Gnoli, op. cit., pp. 25-26.

thought which is 'Thought-only', pure consciousness, and [which] altogether transcends the division between object and subject."[31] Furthermore, the Mahāyāna doctrine of the Buddha nature of things is here replaced by an equally omnipervasive Śiva nature.

Thus Buddhist meditation was absorbed into the Trika, in this manner reinforcing one of Śaivism's four characteristic modalities, contemplativeness. Of the other three, that of devotion was to be expressed in more impassioned language in the theology and literature of the Tamil Siddhanta. The third and fourth modalities are kāma or the fearsome vitality of sex and saṁhāra or destruction and death. The symbols of sex are sublimated and theologized in the Trika's concepts of vibration (spanda or sphurattā) or creation as emission (visarga) and of the hurl of Śiva's power as a sudden thrust (śaktipāta). But the concepts inspired by destruction express, as I said at the beginning of this essay, the essence of Śaivism most compellingly. For the powers or śaktis of Śiva have names which characterize destruction -- such as Blood, Death, the Fearful and Doom. As for Śiva himself, "all things are constituted of the fire of the Supreme Lord" who is the Mahabhairava or the Mighty Terrifying God, possessed of "a desire for devouring all that exists" and is himself the "pure blaze that subsists when all is destroyed."[32] The Śaiva image

---

[31] Edward Conze. Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, p. 78.

[32] Tantrasāra, see appendix.

of destruction is thus made to express the highest moment of Trika and of all Indic religious thought -- liberation, which is peace.

APPENDIX I

TRANSLATION OF Prabodhapañcadaśikā (Enlightenment in Fifteen Verses)

1. He is the being of the form of splendor not subject to setting, the end of lights and darknesses who is also in between lights and darknesses.

2. This supreme lord is indeed the essence of all beings; all that is born of the flux of being is his power (śakti) constituted of lordship.

3. And his divine energy (śakti) does not desire separation from the nature of Śiva; there is always identity between these two just as between fire and flames.

4. This frightful resplendent god has the very characteristic of supporting the world, for the world is completely reflected through his energy (śakti) which is mirrored in his own self.

5. Indeed this highest goddess of his yearns for his essence; her plenitude in all beings is neither excessive nor inadequate.

6. This god, the lord, eternally eager for the taste of play with his inexhaustible goddess, simultaneously disposes the wondrous acts of creation and destruction.

7. His causality very difficult to comprehend is unspeakable and this indeed is independence and lordship and the form of enlightenment.

8. A characteristic of the unintelligible, it is true, is a limited manifestation; in consequence of which, there is an enlightenment different from the unintelligible which is not limited.

9. Thus -- of this independent being who attains difference from his power (_śakti_) -- the essence accompanying creation and destruction abides through his own form.

10. That (being) who (possesses) superabundant variety, in those (five activities: creation, preservation, destruction, obscuration and grace) (extends) upwards, below and sideways, those parts are the worlds, in which there is a sense of joy and sorrow.

11. Of that (being) there is non-recognition and of that one independence has been affirmed. And that (non-recognition) in truth is _samsāra_ which strikes terror into fools.

12. From what has all this come? Has that (understanding) come from the taste of grace itself, or from the acquisition of knowlege through a teacher, or by the instruction of the highest lord?

13. This recognition of the truth is that liberation (granted) from the highest lord. That is the fullness of the enlightened ones and is understood as liberation during life (_jivanmukti_).

14. These two -- bondage and liberation -- arise from the essence of the supreme lord. In truth nothing is divided and there is no division in the supreme lord.

15. In this manner Bhairava -- who is will, the digit, knowledge, power, the trident, the lotus, the resort of all beings, their very essence -- is to be reflected on.

16. These fifteen verses are spoken with fervor by Abhinavagupta to enlighten disciples of tender understanding.

APPENDIX II

TRANSLATION OF TANTRASĀRA: ŚAKTOPAYA
(The Essence of Tantra: Chapter Four, The Divine Power-Means to Liberation)

When with a view to entering the Essential Being already described, discursive knowledge is purified in stages, the need to apply the process of meditative realization in its various stages becomes evident, the process being preceded by the right reasoning, the right scriptures and instruction by the right teachers. Now it is by means of this discursive knowledge alone that people presume that their selves are bound, and it is this very presumption that is the cause of transmigration's uninterruptedness. Hence the rise of an adversative discursive knowledge destroys the discursive knowledge from which transmigration originates -- and thus brings about the dawning of enlightenment. The nature of this knowledge is as follows: it is free from all the limited principles -- beginning with the earth and stopping before Śiva -- and is constituted of pure unlimited consciousness. This is the Supreme Reality, the stability of things and the vital principle of the universe. By it everything breathes, and it is what I myself really am. So I am truly the very self of the universe, but in essence transcending it.

But this awareness does not arise in those whom māyā has blinded, as they lack the modes of knowledge such as right reasoning. Sects like the Vaiṣṇavas, constricted by their attachment to their own scriptures, lack even the curiosity for nobler doctrines, and

are thus enemies of the right reasoning, the true scriptures, and of the instruction of the right teachers. As the author of the Parameśvaratantra says:

> The Vaiṣṇavas and others like them, their minds darkened by ignorance, do not know the Supreme Reality, and are cut off from the knowledge of the All-knowing.

Hence, only those struck by the relentless hurl of Śiva's power, and who have had their discursive knowledge purified in degrees with the aid of the right scriptures and such other means, are able to enter into the Supreme Reality.

Can the Supreme Reality, you might ask, be the object of discursive representation? The answer is no: the work of such a representation ends when the impression of duality is destroyed. As for the Supreme Reality itself -- in all places self-luminous by its very essence -- representation serves no purpose at all, helpful or harmful.

Consequently, in anyone smitten by the hurl of Śiva's concentrated power, and who has thus achieved liberation, the right reasoning spontaneously arises, and such a one is said to be the initiate of the goddesses. But in someone not smitten, that reasoning is occasioned by the study of the Scriptures: I shall deal with this at length when I come to examine the hurlings of divine power (chapter 11). But it is worth recalling now that while the task of the teacher consists in interpreting the Scriptures, that of the Scriptures themselves lies in evoking a corresponding mental representation free of doubt and which is the future source of homogeneous and mutually congenial impressions. And, as I said, true reasoning itself is none other than this very series of

impressions. It is also called "meditative realization", for by restoring clear evidence to an object -- which, though real, seemed to be unreal through lack of evidence -- (it) realizes the object.

Besides the reasoning, which is in essence the light of true knowledge, there is no other part of yoga capable of realizing liberation, as is for instance "asceticism" from among the Group of Disciplines, "non-violence" from the Group of Prohibitions, and "inhalation" from the Group of Respirations. Since all these are based on the knowable, what function can they have with regard to Consciousness? As for the "withdrawal from the senses", it will but confer excellence on the sphere of the senses; "meditation", "concentrated reflection" and "total absorption", accomplished in proper order by "exercise", will realize the identity of the contemplator with the object of his contemplation. But this exercise can not function with regard to the Supreme Reality, the self-existent Śiva-self. For exercise is but the perfecting of the vital breath, the mind and the body of someone imposed on Consciousness -- as for instance in things like the practice of carrying loads, the understanding of the sense of the scriptures, the practice of dancing; as for Consciousness, nothing can be given to or taken away from it. Hence exercise can have no place in it. Perhaps right reasoning can do so? It has been said that the function of that reasoning is the elimination of duality's impression and none other.

Or else exercise can be explained thus: the manifestation (in objects such as bodies) of the desired forms and the exclusion of undesired ones -- of that which is omniformed through its being

in essence Consciousness itself; this is valid also in the case of exercise of a mundane character. As for the Supreme Reality, nothing, as I said, can be taken away from it. The impression of duality is not any autonomously existent thing, but only the ignorance of one's essence; hence, as I remarked, the elimination of duality is brought about by discursive knowledge. This is the Supreme Truth: the luminous essence, gradually abandoning the form of ignorance which it had spontaneously assumed, shines forth — at first as a propensity for revealing itself, then in the act of self-revelation and finally as fully revealed. Hence too illumination is the very nature of the Lord: hence also the constituents of yoga are not direct means of realization. But they can aid right reasoning, and right reasoning -- the direct means of realization -- is none other than the category of Pure Wisdom (sadvidyā-tattva), which is itself realized in many ways: by sacrifice, libation, murmured prayers, vows and yoga.

Of these, sacrifice is the offering of all things to the Supreme Lord alone, with the purpose of strengthening the representation that the sole ground of the existence of all things is none but this very Lord, and that nothing exists apart from him. Hence the exterior use of delightful things (like offered flowers and perfumes) is recommended in view of the fact that all such things, through their capacity to delight, are able to enter consciousness spontaneously; the offering of these to the Supreme Lord is thus easy indeed.

Libation is the dissolution of all things in the blaze of divine consciousness, brought about with the purpose of arriving at the firm idea that all things are constituted of the fire of the

Supreme Lord. Conceived as though he were a desire for devouring all that exists, this Lord is the pure blaze that subsists when all the rest has been destroyed.

Prayer is the interior thought that the Supreme Reality exists in and of itself, with no connotation to the differentiated external and internal knowable forms of reality. This thought is undertaken with the purpose of bringing about a knowledge constituted of these two forms. A vow is the viewing of all things (like bodies and pots) -- at all places and times, and through the conception of equality with the Supreme Lord -- for the attainment of the thought of this Lord who is unattainable by any means at all. As the _Nandiśikhatantra_ puts it:

the supreme vow is the equality of all things . . ..

And lastly yoga is a definite representation which in essence is the attentive reflection of the very being of the Supreme Reality, for corroborating the conviction that all existence is none other than the Ultimate Reality's eternal and absolute light. Though this light illuminates through multiple representations, themselves essentially parts of Pure Wisdom, it is nonetheless wholly independent of them.

Let us recall that the Supreme Lord is by essence the plenitude of Consciousness, and that plenitude is his power, identified in the sacred texts by such names as Family, Efficacy, Undulation, Heart, Essence, Tremor, Magnificence, Lady of the Triads, Kālī, the Temptress, the Terrifying Goddess, Speech, Pleasure, Vision, the Eternal and so on, meaning to imply that she can exist in the hearts of those who meditate on her in one or another of these forms. The

plenary Consciousness illumines in manifesting the totality of power and the Lord's powers are numberless. What more can I say? As great as totality is, so mumerous are his powers -- how can they be spoken of? The totality, however, is comprehended in three powers through which the Lord pervades, sees and illumines everything from Śiva down to the earth -- (a) through pure consciousness incapable of being represented, that is his Highest Power; (b) through difference-in-identity, of which an elephant reflected in a mirror is an example, that is his Highest-Lowest Power; (c) through difference that is in essence mutual exclusion, that one is his Lowest Power.

There is also the power by which the Lord devours in himself the triple-moded totality as though in an embrace and through a process of unification; this is his blessed Highest Power, identified by such names as the Essence of the Mothers and Devourer of Time. Each of these four Powers are freely divided threefold -- in the states of creation, conservation and destruction -- and thus become twelve. They are as follows:

1. Consciousness operating the reality interiorly;
2. then, operating it exteriorly and as fully manifested;
3. next, taking the form of loveliness, operating the same thing with a desire to absorb the thing into itself;
4. next, the consciousness creating and then swallowing the doubt that impedes absorption;
5. next, operating it by means of the absorption of that part of the reality which doubt had affected;

6. then, on the conviction that absorption is its own essence, operating its own being;
7. next, the operation of the essence of absorption completed, operating the state of being through latent impressions (in some things) and the residuum of pure consciousness (in others);
8. then, inseparably with the above-mentioned operation having to do with its own being, operating even the wheel of the senses;
9. then, operating also the ruler of the senses, the Ego;
10. then, operating the knowing subject which is fictitious and illusory;
11. thus operating even the knowing subject that is eager to abandon his state of contractedness and anxious to obtain the state of full manifestation;
12. finally, operating even the fully manifested form.

These twelve blessed powers, identified by the name Kālī, arise in dyads, triads or in more complex combinations, simultaneously or in succession, with regard to the many knowing subjects, or to one such subject only. They unwind in wheel form, either exteriorly (through the digits of the moon, the zodiacal constellations and so forth) or interiorly (through objects like jars and cloths), so increasing the Lord of the Wheel's liberty. Operation thus means motion, hurling, knowledge, numbering, enjoyment, speech and dissolution into oneself. As the master Bhūtirāja says:

> Kālī is so called because she hurls, she has knowledge and because. . . .

You will find this theme handled at length in my commentaries, as in that on the Prakaraṇastotra. As my teacher said, anything that is a great secret should neither be wholly divulged nor wholly hidden.

Hence what I have spoken of with regard to sacrifice, libation and so on, must be understood in relation to the Supreme Lord as I have described him. Though all see the repulsive as the basis of the acceptable, starting with Viṣṇu and going up to Śiva as though they were the Supreme Being itself, it is necessary that the highest yogis free themselves from this false knowledge. This is what Vidyādhipati regards with such strong emotion in his Anubhavastotra. If, in connection with the five elements which we have examined, from sacrifice to yoga, it is necessary to so comport oneself so that one variously confirms oneself in each of them, there is no need at all to torment oneself to distinguish what can from what can not be eaten, and that which is pure from that which is not. All that is said in the Mālinīvijaya goes to confirm this.

For all things that are beyond the scope of the object's intrinsic properties are imaginary constructions of our own making. Indeed, purity is not a quality in things, as for instance blue is, for the very same "pure" thing is asserted by others to be impure -- as for instance a gift at the initiation ceremony. And if it is right to say that its impurity stems from the very fact of its being scripturally enjoined to be such, there is no reason why it can not be affirmed that its purity arises from a contrary religious injunction. Can it be said that subsequent injunctions are false because earlier ones contradict them? No: the power to negate and nullify the doctrines of the schools belongs solely to Śiva's injunctions, as reason, the Sarvajñānottara and numberless other sacred texts prove; more of this later. It has however been established that every precept, whether prohibitive or prescriptive, as enumerated

originally in the Vedas and taught also by the Śaiva scriptures like the Parameśvarasiddhānta, the Tantra, the Kula and the Ucchuṣma, is of little use in this context. This is what texts like the Śrīpurva affirm, and can be examined at length in my Tantrāloka.

The belief of the animal-self, expressed in words like "I am intelligent", "I am bound in karma's noose", "I am controlled by other beings", when it attains to the contrary conviction, the self is at once transformed into the Lord himself, whose body is the universe, and whose soul, consciousness.

When the yogi attains to such a conviction, let him meditate on it steadily and not entertain doubt inspired by the teachings of the foolish and through a vision not apprehensive of the essence of things.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

(See K. C. Pandey, Abhinavagupta: An Historical and Philosophical Study. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1963, pp. 27-30, for a complete list of Abhinavagupta's works both published and unpublished, translated or not.)

Abhinavagupta, Bodhapañcadaśikā and Paramārthacarcā. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, #76-77. Edited and commented on in Sanskrit by Haribhaṭṭaśāstri. Śrīnagar: Krishna Press, 1946-1947.

________. Tantrasāra. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, #17. Edited by Pandit Mukund Ram Shastri. Bombay: Nirnaya-Sagar Press, 1918.

________. Paramārthasāra. Translated by L. D. Barnett. London: Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1910, pp. 707-747.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Ānandavardhana. Dhvanyāloka. Translated by K. Krishnamoorthy. Poona: Oriental Book Agency, 1955.

Ayyar, C. V. N. The Origin and Early History of Śaivism in South India. Madras University, 1936.

Basu, Arabinda. "Kashmir Shaivism" in The Cultural Heritage of India, IV, pp. 79-98. The Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, Calcutta, 1956.

Bharata. Nāṭyaśāstra. Translated by M. Ghosh. Second edition, Calcutta: Manisha Granthalaya, 1967.

Bhoja. Tattva Prakāśa. Translated by E. P. Janvier. Indian Antiquary Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1925.

Bhavnani, Enakshi. The Dance in India. Bombay: Taraporevala, 1925.

Chatterji, J. C. Kashmir Shaivism. Srinagar: Government of Jammu and Kashmir, 1962.

Conze, E. Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia, S. C., 1968.

Coomaraswamy, Ananda. The Dance of Shiva. Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1948.

Das, S. K. Shakti or Divine Power. University of Calcutta: Calcutta Press, 1934.

Das Gupta, Surendranath. A History of Indian Philosophy V. Cambridge at the University Press, 1955.

________. Indian Idealism. Cambridge at the University Press, 1953.

De, S. K. Studies in the History of Sanskrit Poetics II. London: Luzac, 1925.

Denzinger, H. Enchiridion Symbolorum Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder and Company, 1947.

Dhavamony, Mariasusai. Love of God According to Shaiva Siddhānta. Oxford at the University Press, 1971.

Freeman, J. Man and His Symbols. New York: Dell, 1970.

Gajendragadkar, A. B. Notes on the Kāvya Prakāśa of Mammaṭa. Poona: Aryabhushan Press, 1939.

Griffiths, Ralph T. H. Hymns of the Rg Veda. Four Volumes Benares: E. J. Lazarus and Company, 1889-1892.

Gnoli, Raniero. Essenza dei Tantra. Torino: Boringhieri, 1960.

________. The Aesthetic Experience According to Abhinavagupta. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Volume LXII, 1968.

Gonda, Jan. The Vision of the Vedic Poets. The Hague: Mouton, 1963.

________. Vishnuism and Shaivism: A Comparison. University of London: Athlone Press, 1970.

Hume, Robert E. The Thirteen Principal Upanisads. London: Oxford University Press, 1931. Text: Śvetāśvatara Upanisad, with the commentary of Śaṅkarācārya, a Dipika of Saṅkarananda, a Dipika of Narayana, and a Vivaraṇa of Vijñāna Bhagavat. Poona: Anandasrama Press, 1890.

Ingalls, Daniel H. H. An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry: A Translation of the Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965 (Harvard Oriental Series, Volume 44).

Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja. Rasagaṅgādhara. Edited with the Commentary of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa by Pandit Durgaprasad and K. P. Parab, Kāvyamala 12, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1939.

Jung, Carl F. Collected Works
VIII. The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche. Princeton, Bollingen Foundation, 1960.
IX, 1. Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious. Princeton, 1959.

Jung, C. F. Collected Works. continued
IX, 2. Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self. Princeton, 1970.
XI. Psychology and Religion East and West. Princeton, 1969.

Kane, M. V. History of Sanskrit Poetics. Third Revised Edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1961.

Keith, A. B. The Sanskrit Drama. London: Oxford University Press, 1924.

Kingsbury, F. and Phillips, G. E., Translators. Hymns of the Tamil Śaivite Saints. London: Oxford University Press, 1921.

Ksemarāja. Pratyabhijñā Hrdayam. Translated by Karl F. Leidecker. Madras: Adyar, 1938.

Kulandran, Sabapathy. Grace: A Comparative Study of the Doctrine in Christianity and Hinduism. London: Lutterworth, 1964.

Kunjunni-Raja, K. Indian Theories of Meaning. Madras: Adyar, 1963.

Lossky, Vladimir. The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church. English translation published in London by James Clarke and Company, 1957.

Mackay, E. Early Indus Civilization. London: Luzac, 1948.

Mādhava, Sarvadarśanasaṁgraha. Translators E. B. Cowell and A. E. Gough. London: Kegan Paul, 1961.

Mammata. Kāvyaprākāśa. Translated by G. Jha. Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, no date.

Mankhad, D. R. The Types of Sanskrit Drama. Karachi, 1936.

Marshall, John. Mohenjodaro and the Indus Civilization. London: Probsthain, 1931.

Masson, J. L. and Patwardhan, M. V., Translators. Aesthetic Rapture. Deccan College, Poona, 1970.

________. Śāntarasa and Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Aesthetics. Poona: Bhavdarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1969.

Masson-Oursel, Paul and others. Ancient India and Indian Civilization. London: Kegan Paul, 1934.

Monier-Williams, M. A Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Oxford, at the University Press, 1899.

Moraes, G. M. "A Mohenjodaro Figure", in New Review (Calcutta) 10 (July-December, 1939).

Muir, John. Original Sanskrit Texts in the Origin and History of the People of India, Their Religion and Institutions. London: Trubner and Company, 1872.

Naidu, V. N. Tāndava Laksanam: The Fundamentals of Ancient Hindu Dancing. Madras: G. S. Press, 1936.

Pandey, K. C. Abhinavagupta: an Historical and Philosophical Study. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1963.

________. Indian Aesthetics. Second edition. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1959.

Pandit, B. N. A Comparative Study of Kashmir Śaivism. Unpublished dissertation. Punjab University, Chandigarh, 1969.

Pannikar, K. M. A Survey of Indian History. Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1957.

Pereira, J. V. The Influence of Śaivism on the Rock Temples of the Deccan and the Konkan. Unpublished dissertation. Bombay: St. Francis Xavier University, 1958.

Piet, John H. A Logical Presentation of the Shaiva Siddhānta Philosophy. Indian Research Series VIII, Madras: Christian Literary Society for India, 1952.

Radhakrishnan, S., Tr. The Principal Upanishads. London: Allen and Unwin, 1968.

Raghavan, V. The Number of Rasa-s. Madras: Adyar, 1967.

Sankaran, A. The Theories of Rasa and Dhvani. Madras: Adyar, 1929.

Sastri, A. S. and Pansikar, V. L., Eds. Bhāmatī: A Commentary on Śankara's Brahmasūtrabhāsyam. Bombay, 1917.

Sastri, K. A. N. "A Historical Sketch of Śaivism" in The Cultural Heritage of India IV, pp. 63-79. Edited by H. Bhattacharyya. The Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture. Calcutta, 1956.

Sen, R. K. Aesthetic Enjoyment: Its Background in Philosophy and Medicine. University of Calcutta, 1966.

Śrīkumāra. Commentary on Bhoja's Tattva Prakāśa. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series as cited by J. V. Pereira in his unpublished dissertation, The Influence of Śaivism on the Rock Temples of the Deccan and the Konkan. Bombay: St. Francis Xavier University, 1958.

Viśvanātha. Sāhityadarpana III. Edited by P. V. Kane. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965, fifth edition.

Wheeler, Mortimer. The Indus Civilization. Cambridge at the University Press, 1968.

Windisch, E. Geschicte der Sanskritische Philologie und Altertums Kunde I. Strassburg: Trubner, 1917-1920.

Winternitz, E. A History of Indian Literature. N. Y.: Russell and Russell, 1933.

Zaehner, R. C. Hindu and Muslim Mysticism. London: Athlone Press, 1960.

________. Mysticism Sacred and Profane. London: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Zimmer, Heinrich. Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilization. N. Y., Harper Torchbooks, 1962.

GLOSSARY

Ābhāsavāda -- the Teaching of Appearance.

Abhinava Bhāratī -- Abhinava's Commentary on the Treatise on Drama.

ācārya -- teacher.

advaita -- not-two.

ahaṁkāra -- the "I" sense.

ākāśa -- the sky.

akhyāti -- non-intuition.

ālambana vibhāva -- subject determinant.

alaukika -- extraordinary, transcendental.

Amṛta Manthana -- the Churning of the Ocean.

ānanda -- bliss.

Āṇavamala -- the impurity of egoism.

anubhava -- intuition.

anubhāva -- consequent.

Anupāya -- Means-Without-Means.

aruḷcatti -- Śiva's liberating power of grace in Tamil Siddhānta.

asat -- non-being.

asura -- demon.

avikalpa -- nondiscursive knowledge.

avyatireka turīyātīta -- mystical experience in which objectivity does not persist in the subconscious.

bhakti -- devotion.

bhedābheda -- difference/non-difference

bimbapratibimbavāda -- the teaching of reflection-secondary reflection.

buddhi -- impersonal judgment.

camatkāra -- surprise.

cārvāka -- atheistic school.

carvaṇa -- interior gustation.

cit -- intelligence.

darśanas -- philosophies.

Dhvani -- the theory of suggestion.

guṇas -- qualities.

Hara -- Śiva.

icchā -- will, supreme ability.

Īśvaratattva -- the Lord category.

jivanmukti-- the liberated soul in this life.

jñāna -- knowledge.

jñānendriyas -- the perceptual capacities.

kalā -- limited action.

kāla -- time.

kālīs -- śaktis.

Kalanālārudrakālī -- the Terrifying Kali of the Fire of Doom.

kañcukas -- sheaths.

Karmamala -- the impurity of action and its fruits.

karmendriyas -- the active capacities.

Kāpālikas -- the Skull-bearers.

kevala -- isolation.

Kramavāda -- the teaching of Gradualness.

Kulavāda -- the teaching of Suddenness.

kriyā -- the power of creating.

lakṣana -- indication.

Lākulīśa -- the Lord of the Club.

Mahābhairavacaṇḍograhorakālī -- the Frightful Kali of the Mighty Terrifying God.

Mahākālakālī -- the Kali of the Great Death God.

maṇḍala -- circle.

maṅgala -- auspicious.

Martaṇḍakālī -- the Kali of the Sun.

Mṛtyukālī -- the Kali of Death.

mahābhūtas -- the gross elements.

Maheśvara -- the Great Lord.

mala -- impurity.

manas -- the capacity to focus attention and to imagine.

mantra -- mystical verse.

māyā -- self-obscuration.

māyai -- the material principle of the body and of the universe for Tamil Siddhānta.

mayīyamala -- the impurity of embodiment.

mokṣa -- liberation.

Nāṭarāja -- Lord of the Dance.

nāṭya -- the drama, including gesture, dance and music.

Nāṭyaśāstra -- the Treatise of Drama of Bharata's.

nṛtta -- just dance.

nṛtya -- gesture and dance.

niyati -- space.

Paramārkakālī -- the Kali of the Supreme Sun.

pariṇāma -- development, transformation.

paruṣa -- dreary.

Pārvatī -- Śiva's consort.

paśupa -- protector of cattle.

paśupati -- Lord of beasts.

pati-paśu-pāśa -- lord-creature-bond.

pradhāna -- material cause or primary matter.

Prajāpati -- Lord of creatures.

prakāśa -- illumination, luminosity.

prakṛti -- the world.

pratibhā -- intuition, imagination, an impulse manifestative of Śiva.

Pratyabhijñā -- recognition.

probandum -- conclusion.

probans -- premise.

Pūrṇa Saṁvid -- Complete Consciousness.

purṇatva -- fullness.

puruṣa -- man.

rāga -- limited interest.

Raktakālī -- the Kali of blood.

rasa -- sentiment.

rasadhvani -- the suggestion of sentiment.

rasaniṣpattiḥ -- rasa is produced.

rasasūtra -- "Sentiment comes from the combination of the determinants, consequents and transient emotions."

Rudrakālī -- the Fearful Kali.

śakti -- Divine Power.

śaktis -- divisions of Divine Power.

śaktipāta -- the descent of Śiva's grace.

śaktitattva -- the Divine Power Category; the self-consciousness of the transcendent.

śāktopāya -- the Divine Power Means.

śama -- peace.

śambhavopāya -- Śiva-Means.

śāntarasa -- the aesthetic experience of tranquillity.

Śivatattva -- the Śiva-category; the conceptualization of Being in itself.

Śrīkaṇṭha -- both the name of a Śaiva theologian and an alternate for Śiva.

śuddha -- pure.

Sṛṣṭikālī -- the Kali of creation.

sadāśivatattva -- the category of Incipient Empirical Being.

sadvidyātattva -- the category of Pure Wisdom.

sakala -- bound.

Samāveśa -- the merging of dependent existence into the independent one.

Saṁhārakali -- the Kali of destruction.

saṁhitā -- collection.

saṁsāra -- the eternal cycle of births and deaths.

sat -- being.

sattva -- goodness.

spanda -- vibration.

sphoṭa -- pattern.

sphurattā -- vibration.

sthāyibhāva -- the permanent emotion.

sthitināśakālī -- the Kali of Conservation and of Destruction.

svatāntrya -- Śiva's independence, identified with śakti.

Tamas -- darkness.

Tāṇḍava -- Śiva's violent dance.

tanmātrās -- the subtle elements.

Trika -- the Threefold system of Kashmir Śaivism, Abhinava's principal school.

Tripura -- the triple town.

Tripuradāha -- the burning of the triple town.

triśūla -- Śiva's trident.

uddīpana vibhāva -- illuminant determinant.

vāsanās -- latent impressions.

vidyā -- knowledge as limited.

vikalpa -- discursive knowledge.

vimarśa -- Self-consciousness.

viśrānti -- repose.

Viśvakarman -- the Creator of the universe.

visarga -- emission; identified with śakti.

"Vismayo yogabhūmikā" -- the yogic stages are astonishment.

vivarta -- appearance (in Advaita Vedānta it is a technical term).

vyabhicāribhāva -- transient emotion.

vyatireka turīyātīta -- mystical experience in which objectivity persists in the subconscious.

Yamakālī -- the Kali of the God of Death.

Richard F. Cefalu

B.A. St. Francis College, N.Y.

M. A. Fordham University, N.Y.

Shakti in Abhinavagupta's Concept of Moksha

Dissertation directed by José Pereira, Doctor of Philosophy

Abhinavagupta's problem is God's relation to man and the world. Śiva's power (śakti) initiates the rise of an unmanifested world within his own experience with which he partly identifies. Desiring the manifestation of this world, Śiva inexplicably allows himself to feel its want, which he then fills through the projection of the empirical world. Through the category of the self-veiling of divinity (māyā-tattva), a number of categories unfold which increasingly limit it. Hence the infinite becomes restricted in action and knowledge temporally and spatially: God becomes man. Similarly what was within Śiva's experience as God -- the latent objectivity of the world -- becomes actually objective within his experience as man. This complete transitional process from God to man is a self-assumed distortion made possible through the Divine Power. Conversely it is this very Power which can correct the self-imposed misapprehension. Therefore, Divine Power causes both bondage and liberation. This thesis proceeds to investigate divine power as liberative.

Abhinava treats of śakti's contemplative aspect in the Tantrāloka, Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vivṛti Vimarśinī and Īśvara

Pratyabhijñā Vimarśinī which are only available in partial translation. In two of his other works he also discusses this topic. These are the Prabodhapañcadaśikā and the fourth chapter of the Tantrasāra which are first rendered into English in this dissertation. In the first composition he speaks of the intimate union of God and his Power; in the second he describes in detail the part śakti plays in liberation. The latter entails the appearance of twelve śaktis -- divisions of Divine Power -- in contemplative consciousness. The devotee who has entered upon one of the three paths to liberation enjoined by the Trika school, after sustained practice of the meditative discipline, enjoys a vision of twelve Divine Powers, which appear as a rapidly rotating circle of light. They assume such concrete forms as Kālī, the Temptress, the Terrifying Goddess, and effect liberation, the peaceful union with divine consciousness. Recent Jungian research has confirmed the profound psychological side of this mandala.

A second aspect of Divine Power is the aesthetic experience of tranquillity (śāntarasa). This perception is a liberating realization which is suggested by the three modes of aesthetic portrayal in poetry and drama -- the determinants, consequents and transient emotions. Abhinava's theory of śāntarasa is based on Bharata's Treatise on the Drama (Nāṭyaśāstra). It incorporates Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's concept of generalization, which posits the identification of the spectator with the actor through the impersonalization of the three aesthetic

modes. It appropriates Ānandavardhana's theory of suggestion, which holds that words not only denote and indicate but also suggest; when this implied sense of words is used, the object so expressed is rendered beautifully. Abhinava adds to these previous ideas his own notion that in a drama or poem the permanent emotion becomes impersonalized, thus lifting the spectator out of himself into a blissful supranormal dimension.

Abhinava develops this transcendental aspect of sentiment in line with the belief that the purpose of poetry and drama is the same as that of religious life -- bliss. The identification of these two goals is evident in his understanding of *śāntarasa*. Abhinava's best exposition of this sentiment is found in his commentary on the *Treatise on Drama* (*Abhinava Bhāratī*). There he shows that the Self -- Śiva -- is the permanent emotion of *śāntarasa*; when one experiences consciousness of Śiva through the sentiment of tranquillity, one attains the bliss which is peace.

Therefore, Abhinava's concept of *śakti* demonstrates that absorption in God's stillness is realizable both contemplatively and aesthetically.

VITA

Richard Francis Cefalu, son of Frank P. and Marie A. (Cirri) Cefalu, was born on November 29, 1944 in Brooklyn, New York. He attended St. Francis Preparatory School in Brooklyn, New York, and was graduated in June, 1962.

He entered St. Joseph College, Callicoon, New York, in September, 1962 and was a novice in the Society of Jesus from September, 1963 to April, 1965 at Bellarmine College, Plattsburgh, N.Y. In September, 1965 he entered St. Francis College, Brooklyn, New York, where he received the degree of Bachelor of Arts cum laude in Philosophy in June, 1968.

In September, 1968 he was accepted as a graduate student in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Fordham University, and received the degree of Master of Arts in Theology in June, 1970. From September, 1970 through June, 1973 he was a graduate assistant in the Theology Department where he continued his studies in the History of Religions under the mentorship of Professor José Pereira. He is married and the father of one child.